CHILD STUDY

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL of PARENT EDUCATION

WINTER, 1941-1942

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Editorial	34
What We Can Learn from England by Martha M. Eliot, M.D.	35
The Home Front and the National Emergency	38
Family Morale and American Unity	41
Children in a Threatened World	44
Parents' Questions and Discussion	48
Suggestions for Study	50
Book Reviews	51
Children's Books	52
In the Magazines	53
Radio and Our Children	54
Annual Meeting	57
News and Notes	60

THIRTY CENTS A COPY VOL. XIX, NO. 2 ONE DOLLAR A YEAR

EDITORIAL BOARD

PAULINE RUSH FADIMAN
Managing Editor
SIDONIE MATSNER GRUENBERG
ANNA W. M. WOLF
JOSETTE FRANK

EDITORIAL ASSOCIATES

ZILPHA CARRUTHERS FRANKLIN
HELEN G. STERNAU

CHARLOTTE WILLIAMS
Advertising Manager

CHILD STUDY reentered as second class matter December 6, 1939, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Copyright, 1942, by Child Study Association of America, Inc. Published by the Child Study Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y. Quarterly in Fall, Winter, Spring and Summer issues; published in November, February, April and June. Thirty cents a copy, one dollar a year. Add twenty-five cents for all foreign subscriptions.

HEADLINES

This issue of CHILD STUDY presents the highlights of the Annual Institute held by the Child Study Association in New York, on November 14, 1941.

★

Participating in the sessions of the Institute were:

On *The Home Front and National Defense:* W. Carson Ryan, President of the Child Study Association and Professor of Education, University of North Carolina; Paul V. McNutt, Federal Security Administrator; Brigadier General Lewis B. Hershey, National Director of the Selective Service; Mark A. McCloskey, Director of Recreation, Federal Security Agency.

On *Family Morale and American Unity:* Eduard C. Lindeman, Professor of Social Philosophy, New York School of Social Work; Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Assistant Director of the Office of Civilian Defense; David M. Levy, M.D., Psychiatrist; Everett R. Clinchy, President, National Conference of Christians and Jews; Dorothy Canfield Fisher, author.

On *Children in a Threatened World:* Sidonie M. Gruenberg, Director of the Child Study Association of America; Martha M. Eliot, M.D., Associate Chief, Children's Bureau, U. S. Department of Labor; James M. Plant, M.D., Director, Essex County Juvenile Clinic; and Susan Isaacs (paper read), British child psychologist and author.

★

The Spring issue of CHILD STUDY (mid-April) will discuss "New Voices Speak to Our Children"—movies, comics and radio.

EDITORIAL

IN THESE perilous times not the least of the hazards which the nation faces is the threat to family life. Families must adjust to physical disruption, to rapid transplantation, to physical and social deprivation, to divergent loyalties, and to intensified emotional strains. Nor can one discount the readiness of families and communities alike in times of stress to throw over slowly evolved democratic procedures in a panicky retreat to force and rigid control. There is no little danger that in meeting the immediate demands of the emergency we may inadvertently sacrifice those very values for which we are about to fight.

THE Child Study Association of America is convinced that time spent in evaluating and adjusting family relationships, as they are dramatized by the crisis of today, is time well invested in assuring the goals of tomorrow; that time spent in understanding the needs of children and their parents under present rapidly shifting conditions is time well invested for defense.

ACCORDINGLY the Child Study Association planned and organized its 1941 Institute, which is briefly reported in this issue *—a conference on Family Morale in a World at War. The discussions attempt to clarify the position of the family in the present emergency: to point out, on the one hand, the rôle of the family in the defense of the nation; to suggest, on the other, the peculiar dangers and strains to which the family will inevitably be subjected—the special precautions which will be needed for its protection.

WE ARE dedicated to the position that the strength of a nation, physical and spiritual, is nurtured in its homes, that family morale is the basis of all morale.

THE EDITORS

* The conference papers will appear in full in a book to be published by Harper & Bros., "Family Morale in a World at War," edited by Sidonie M. Gruenberg.

What We Can Learn from England

By MARTHA M. ELIOT, M.D.

IF EVER in the history of our nation it has been wise to stop and consider what is happening to children and take stock of the progress made in providing an environment in which they can grow and develop into vigorous, well-poised, cooperative members of a democratic society, that time is today. If ever there has been a need for action to put into effect each of the procedures known to be essential to the health and well-being and social adjustment of each individual child, that need is today.

To find the way to do this, it is not necessary to go beyond the borders of our own land for examples of effective action and progress, of research and investigation that has been productive of much basic information that has practical applicability. But the program of action for children in the United States today is spotty and incomplete. Today we have no such close-meshed network of maternity care and child-health service as did Great Britain at the beginning of the present war. Only in recent years have we begun to spread across the country even a coarse network of basic health and social services for children; and today the holes and gaps in the net are only too apparent.

The rapid growth of the defense program in the past sixteen months and the great movements of people to places wholly unequipped to meet even their own usual needs have brought into strong light the fundamental defects in our provisions for the health and well-being of children. The present migration of workers is not a movement of men wage-earners alone. Families are there—babies, little children, school children, adolescent youth, pregnant and nursing mothers—all crowding into tenements, living in trailers, in shacks, in improvised dwellings of all kinds. Many children are without school, many mothers and children without medical care or health supervision. It is not always a question of whether these people can pay or not; often the facilities for health supervision and medical care of the children and maternity care for the mothers just do not exist. There may be too few doctors, or even none, in the mushroom communities; frequently there is no hospital for many miles. Often there is no child-welfare worker to advise parents on the multitude of new social situations which affect the lives of children and result in social maladjustment and conflict with the law. With the increased demand for labor in war industries, women are being drawn into jobs, even women with young children who need to be cared for in their mother's absence. Children too are being drawn into labor, and young children are being exploited by commercial interests in the street trades.

It is perhaps too much to expect that we should have had on hand at the beginning of a period of national crisis a reserve corps of workers ready to be moved into areas of need as soon as the need arose, but certainly we should have reached the position where each and every community had at least the organization and the child health and welfare workers that we recognize as fundamental for everyday needs and which would have been the nucleus of an expanding program to meet the emergency defense needs. The great inadequacy or even utter lack of health and medical, social and recreational services for children and young people in many of our boom towns and industrial cities is more characteristic of an early pioneering society than of a settled and prosperous nation. There has been ample opportunity during the past decade to learn how to meet the needs of great migrating groups of people. Had we seized it, we would now know better how to meet more effectively the present needs of the migrant armies of workers in war industries.

So far, in this national crisis, national resources have not been tapped to spread more widely or more effectively the basic program or to meet the additional needs of the nation's mothers and children. Must we wait until this war is over to discover that the conservation of child life is important to our national life? Must we wait until the most serious situations are actually upon us to patch up the known gaps in our defense program for mothers and children and be ready at least with a mobile corps of trained professional and volunteer workers to meet more acute emergencies?

I ask these questions not to be oratorical, but to put squarely before you the situation with which we are faced and to ask you to consider what should be

done. Let us turn to the experiences of Great Britain and see what we may learn that would be helpful in our present situation.

Steps to protect children in time of war in Great Britain were taken by the Government and by others charged with their protection in time of peace in three periods: the long period of peacetime action since the last war (1918-38), the period from just before the Munich crisis in 1938 to the declaration of war in September, 1939, and the later period of action under the impact of actual war.

The basic provisions for child health and maternity care that have been developed throughout Great Britain during the past two decades and those for school medical service that have been in effect still longer are, without doubt, fundamental factors in the success of the emergency measures instituted for the protection of children during the present war. By sad experience at the outbreak of war, the Government authorities learned that full quotas of medical and nursing personnel must be kept available for the maternity and child-health and school medical service in the bombed industrial cities and in the reception areas to which the children were to be evacuated. And they learned that this personnel cannot be safely assigned to the Emergency Medical Service for work in casualty stations or first-aid units. The voluntary acceptance by parents of the drastic measures for evacuation of their children depended to a considerable extent upon the general knowledge that child-health and school medical services would be available everywhere in the provinces as well as in the large cities. The Government authorities knew that in practically every local jurisdiction they could count on the existence of child-health clinics, school medical service including treatment clinics for minor ailments, district nursing services, health visitors, trained, skillful midwives, prenatal clinics, hospital care, and medical consultation for maternity patients. They knew, too, that a school-meal program was in effect in at least sixty per cent of all local school systems and that free meals were available in fifty per cent.

It was said, in February 1941, by responsible health authorities, that in the rural sections of the counties used as reception areas for London children no mother would have to go more than six or seven miles at the most to take her child to a children's clinic and that the great majority could attend clinics within their own towns or villages. Obviously the sudden influx of children into towns or villages, sometimes doubling the child population, put a great strain on local health services. Supplementing the local health workers by nurses, physicians, midwives, and child-care workers (social workers) from the evacuated cities proved to be one important way of meeting the pressures on the local staff. The nation-wide prewar child-health service has made possible, as no impromptu emergency service could, a program of health protection for children in the bombed cities and for those evacuated to the country that is, under the circumstances, extraordinarily effective and complete.

The wartime maternity program for women normally resident in London and other evacuation areas has been an outstanding success. The early decision to evacuate pregnant women who desired it, as one of the priority groups, made it possible to develop plans long before war was declared. The selecting, equipping, and staffing of premises suitable for maternity homes not too far from the cities and usually in large country houses inevitably took time. Though some premises were selected early, insufficient funds prior to the declaration of war made it impossible for the Ministry of Health to equip and staff the new maternity homes sufficiently in advance. When evacuation was ordered few of them were ready. Confinements had to be arranged for in private households, and this did not prove satisfactory. With the declaration of war, funds became available, and maternity homes were quickly put in order. Not until bombing started, however, did they become very popular with London women. Then, suddenly, the demand grew until, by December 1940, seventy-five per cent of births which usually took place in London were taking place outside the city. In February 1941, ninety maternity homes were in operation, each staffed with resident trained and experienced midwives, a resident physician, and if there were more than forty beds a resident obstetrician. Furthermore, thirty additional maternity homes had been equipped and were being held in reserve. The success of this wartime maternity program can be traced directly to the high quality of the prewar nation-wide service and to the skill used in its adaptation to emergency conditions. It was everywhere recognized that the war situation was sufficient reason for exerting every effort to provide the best possible maternity care. The reward can be found in the continued decrease in the maternal mortality rate in both 1939 and 1940.

Second only to the contribution made by these basic health programs to the protection of children and mothers in wartime has been that made by the longtime development of nursery education methods and daytime care of young children in nursery schools and day nurseries. At the outbreak of the

war the number of nursery schools throughout the country was not large but the principle of nursery education was well established in many of the day nurseries. Day nurseries already numerous in the industrial cities before the war have become even more so since the inclusion this year of thousands of women in the industrial war effort. The adoption by the Ministry of Health and the Board of Education of the policy of employing teachers trained in nursery education methods as members of the staff of all wartime nurseries is evidence enough that the British people and their government are aware of the importance of this phase of child care for the future of the nation.

Nursery centers for evacuated children, which are usually modified nursery schools operated on the basis of a few hours a day, were started soon after the first great evacuation in the fall of 1939. Today they are being developed more and more widely as essential community services in all reception areas. For an evacuated mother who is billeted with her children in a private household or who has her own quarters in a communal housing unit, the opportunity to take her young children to a nursery center for several hours each day may mean the difference between reasonable adjustment to her new surroundings or return to her home in the city. Though it was many months after war was declared before real impetus was given to the development of nursery centers for evacuated children and to wartime nurseries for the daytime care of young children whose mothers were at work in industrial cities, today the movement is receiving strong support from the British Government.

A word should be said at this point about the residential nurseries which have been established under the auspices of private agencies in large country houses for the care of children under five years of age whose mothers for good reasons could not leave the cities under bombing. Though twenty-four-hour care of young children in groups is deprecated in England as it is here, the necessity of establishing such residential nurseries was seen even before war was declared. The lack of a widespread prewar social-work program of child placement for young children, and the almost complete absence at the outbreak of war of social workers in the provinces who could select and supervise the great number of foster homes needed under the evacuation plans, meant that it was impossible for the British authorities to consider a plan of foster-home care of very young children in private homes.

At first, residential nurseries were established to take care only of the groups of children who were attending private day nurseries or nursery schools in cities under bombing. Later parties of young children were made up from families who had been bombed out and whose mothers were working in essential industries and could not be spared. After the first evacuation in September 1939, standards of care in the residential nurseries were set by the Maternity and Child Welfare Division of the Ministry of Health. These standards regulated the number of children in any one group and their sleeping and play space, established medical and nursing supervision and nursery school methods, and supervised the pasteurization of milk and provisions for isolation facilities. The increased responsibility assumed by the government for these nurseries has proved to be a great advantage, especially as the number of nurseries has increased. Though the government now assumes practically all of the basic costs, private contributions continue to pay for many extras, such as play equipment, and private agencies still operate the service.

UNLIKE the child-health services, social services for children had not been universally established in Great Britain. Before the war almost the only social workers who were specially trained for work with children were the child-care organizers attached to the London school system and the psychiatric social workers in the child-guidance clinics. The important part that could be played by such well-trained social workers in assisting the authorities in the organization of community services for evacuated mothers and children was not appreciated when the first evacuation took place.

Volunteers traditionally had carried the responsibility of child-welfare service, and many had received the training that long experience gives. For years citizens had taken part in the affairs of government, as magistrates, aldermen, council members, education and child-care committee members, and child-care committee workers. Women had been accustomed to giving considerable amounts of time to volunteer work of a regular and important nature. Many women had had a long experience in child-care activities. It was natural that they should be called on in time of war to assume new duties in the welfare field. As plans for the protection of children were drawn up and put into operation, nearly all responsibility for welfare services was placed by the Government and by local authorities in the hands

(*Continued on page 61*)

The Home Front and the National Emergency

Chairman: W. Carson Ryan
Speakers: Governor Paul V. McNutt, Brigadier General Lewis B. Hershey, Mark A. McCloskey

The effectiveness and morale of the nation depend upon each individual; the basic attitudes of the individual are established in the home. What kind of help can we offer families which will serve them as reorientation?

THE HOME FRONT AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

By GOVERNOR PAUL V. McNUTT

THERE are hundreds of thousands of children in the world today who do not know the meaning of peace. These children do not remember a time when there were no bombs falling, or what it was like not to be a little hungry and a little cold. For more than two years half the civilized world has been compelled to sacrifice most of the values of home and family life to the all-consuming destruction of armed aggression.

Even before the long arm of aggression reaches America, there are two urgent and immediate issues that no one can neglect. The first issue is very simple and far-reaching: we have engaged in an all-out effort for national defense for the past eighteen months because we believe that the American way of life shall be ordered according to the collective conscience of Americans, and not be subject to direct or indirect dictation from elsewhere.

The second issue is equally simple and far-reaching. Even without the ultimate emergency of enemy attack, we must realize that our country is in a state of upheaval. Millions of men under arms, more millions on the industrial lines of defense, families uprooted, boom towns flourishing where a year ago there were cornfields, manufacturers working against time to fill government orders, women working in factories along with their husbands, children left to shift for themselves—all of those are part of the national upheaval.

A nation in a crisis, like any sensible family, has to decide for itself what it can do without, temporarily, and what it must preserve at all costs. The main lines of this decision have been pretty clear since the start of the defense program. There never has been any question that the health and welfare of *all* the people are essential to defense. There never has been any question that we would utilize and strengthen *all* the machinery of our democratic government to help safeguard them.

We cannot think of defense only in purely military terms. The experience of Germany toward the end and after World War I and the appalling experience of France during the Spring of 1940 prove that an army, no matter how well equipped, is no stronger than the people behind the lines. Civilian health and welfare is clearly a valid part of defense.

The present situation brings tremendous potential assets as well as liabilities. We are now much more aware of long-standing needs. At last we are attempting to back up essential legal and medical protection with equally essential social protection. We are recognizing the right of young people to a more solid foundation on which to build their lives. Our young people need wholesome homes, free from the corrosion of fear and abject want; training for jobs and a chance to get jobs; opportunity for the fun and adventure that is part of youth in ways that deepen, rather than destroy, the values and satisfactions of awakening maturity. This is a part of national defense, now and for the future.

Meanwhile health cannot wait. And we need not wait for one basic means of improving the health of our own families and of the nation. Food use for health is a number one item not only for defense, but for all the time for all the people.

During the last ten years more progress has been made in the science of nutrition than at any time in the past. Yet with all this knowledge and with the greatest food resources in the world, we are not well fed. Selective Service figures indicate that out of a million men, 150,000 were found unfit for military service because of physical disabilities due, directly or indirectly, to malnutrition.

Utilizing food to improve health is a national responsibility; it involves nationwide production, distribution, buying, and consumer education. Every state in the Union has a nutrition committee tied in with its State Defense Council. And many local communities are already at work to combat the ignorance

and poverty that underscore this need. But malnutrition is not wholly an economic problem, nor are ignorance and apathy confined to the so-called underprivileged. We can all of us improve our eating habits.

Federal agencies stand ready to help: the Department of Agriculture, the Consumers' Division of the Office for Emergency Management, the National Nutrition Advisory Committee. But the job itself rests in the homes and communities.

This is true all along the line. For all of us personal responsibilities are intensified by present pressures. Defense demands that our concern must expand to our neighbors, our communities, and the whole nation. Fortunately, people are always more ready to pull together in a crisis; and out of that quirk of human nature, times like these can draw another lasting asset.

IMPACT OF THE DRAFT ON THE AMERICAN FAMILY

By

BRIGADIER GENERAL LEWIS B. HERSHEY

WHEN we consider the impact of the draft on the American family, we find it far-reaching. Practically every man who has been inducted into the armed forces through Selective Service came from a family, and that family has been more or less poignantly affected by his departure. But when we weigh the quality of the effect of the draft, we can conclude quite simply that the sum total is good and not evil. It is true that the family suffers inconvenience, and there is grief over separations; often financial sacrifice is entailed, and anxiety puts its mark on those left at home. But these considerations are outweighed usually by moral values which accrue to that family, strengthening it and enriching it. The family comes to a more vivid consciousness of its place in the national life and its part in the great events which impend. That son who has gone forth to prepare for defense of the country becomes something more than a casual youngster, taken for granted. His common clay is charged now with a new and more precious meaning for those at home. He will come back to his family with a better idea of what it is he prepared himself to defend. This brings a quickening of national life, a closer contact with the spirit of democracy, and a more immediate sense of its meaning and the dangers which threaten it.

Separation does not necessarily mean disruption. Since family life began, men have gone forth from their families—to the sea, to far countries in search of fortune, to the wars. The family carries on, often becoming more closely knit as it waits and plans the return of its fathers and sons and husbands.

One of the most interesting characteristics of the Selective Service Act and its administration is the elaborate precautions taken to safeguard the industrial and social welfare of the nation, particularly the needs of families. The local boards have been urged to make the most liberal interpretation of the regulations governing dependency deferments. They have been asked to consider the necessity for the maintenance of the family unit in the national interest—to bear in mind the harm that may result in separating fathers and children and husbands and wives.

The problem of deferment for dependency involves the most vital function of the local boards. They must exercise a wide discretion, deciding each case by itself and avoiding any easy or universal rule. From the beginning, National Headquarters has refrained from limiting this discretion by any hard and fast interpretations. The complexities of human life are such that no two cases are exactly identical no matter how much they may seem to be on the surface. Apparent inconsistencies in Local Board decisions usually dissolve when the facts are known. The Local Board acts on confidential knowledge of the circumstances which may clearly distinguish one case from another, no matter how similar they may appear to outsiders.

The attitude of the Local Boards toward the newly married registrant varied at first all the way from complete exclusion of his claim for deferment to broad acceptance of the inevitability of marriage and that a wife is a dependent no matter how, when or why acquired. The increased rate of marriage among registrants has compelled National Headquarters to give very serious considerations to measures for restricting the use of marriage as a means of evading the obligation to serve in the armed forces. We are now faced with the problem of defending the home and the family against those who would use these institutions as a means for evading military service. Selective Service must view with alarm the use of the establishment of homes on the insecure basis of evasion. During the past, most policies announced from National Headquarters place upon the registrant the necessity for establishing by positive means the fact that he did not marry to evade the obligations of military service. Since the beginning, Selective

Service has attempted to protect the home from any unnecessary removal of husbands or fathers.

But we cannot contend that the draft has not profoundly shaken the American family. To a people emerging from the privations and stresses of a world-wide depression, this new call for sacrifice must of course present disturbing and even terrifying prospects. That they have accepted it on the whole with equanimity and fortitude is the best proof possible of the underlying unity of America. There is no real clash in American feeling, no deep dispute over what it is America wants to preserve. Americans share a dream in common and they will see to it that the dream is not shattered.

The American family is the nation. What it thinks and does is the expression of the national will. It sends its sons to camp to serve no grandiose purpose of conquest. It pools its precious liberties only to preserve a way of life in which men may live and breathe without terror, and work out their own small destinies in their own way. That has been America. That will be America when the storm is over.

RECREATION IN NATIONAL DEFENSE

By MARK A. McCLOSKEY

THE mobilization of men in the armed forces and the concentration of men and women in defense industries have had far-reaching results on community life. We are determined, in meeting this crisis, not only to provide to the best of our ability for those who are carrying the burden of the defense program, but at the same time to create out of this situation permanent gains in community life. Unlike the totalitarian countries, we do not have a predetermined pattern. Our future rests, instead, upon our freedom of action guided by our faith in the democratic way of life.

The organization of morale activities in the Army and Navy is now a recognized branch of military and naval service. During the last war, private agencies were responsible for morale activities in the camps and overseas. When the war was over, the Army and Navy assumed these responsibilities and morale divisions were created. They are aided by the Joint Army and Navy Committee on Welfare and Recreation. The morale divisions are responsible for supervision of program, for post exchanges, athletics, entertainment, recreation, and other problems incidental to those social services which go to make a person feel at ease while he is away from home. One person is designated in every regiment, whose sole task it is to provide and organize recreational activities sufficient for every man in the regiment. This is a great advance over past procedure.

The next step is to see that posts are filled with people selected and trained in their special field just as rigorously and carefully as for any other branch of the service. The Navy has recognized this by calling people from civilian life who have had training and successful experience in recreational work.

When on leave the soldier and sailor go to town. The recreation program within the army and navy posts must, therefore, be supplemented by community activities. A heavy burden is placed on cities, towns and villages near these new concentrations of armed forces. Many of them have gone through very difficult times.

In order to meet this unprecedented situation, the towns had to learn how to organize for recreation activity. The Federal Security Agency was designated to aid in this process and the Division of Recreation with a staff of seventy field workers was created for this purpose. We help the towns to organize and they do the job. There is no substitute for the organization of hospitality and recreation of the town itself. No amount of imported recreation or imported hospitality is any substitute. The boys cannot be fooled; a town is either a good town for soldiers or it is not. And the factor in the situation which makes it a good town is the spirit of the people who are aware of the problem and straining every effort and resource to meet it. The eager appreciation of the boys is reward in itself.

The industrial areas are more difficult but no less important. Many people think that provision for recreation in these centers is not necessary. They hear that the men are making big money. What does big money mean? It means buying power. But they can't buy safety for their children in school and play. They can't buy a place for women to get together. They can't buy community spirit. Often they can't even buy an ice cream soda or a movie ticket because the demand so far exceeds the supply. The nearby towns have been overwhelmed with the demands upon them. They need help and the new trailer communities and the people living in the Federal Housing Units need help. And the large cities whose normal community activities are overburdened by a sudden new increase of community problems arising from the sudden congestion of defense industries in

(*Continued on page 64*)

Family Morale and American Unity

Chairman: Eduard C. Lindeman
Speakers: Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, David M. Levy, M.D., Everett R. Clinchy
Guest of Honor: Dorothy Canfield Fisher

What are the effects on families of economic and other changes? What is the effect on children when families are constantly on the march, with no stable homes? Race prejudices are likely to be sharpened in times of stress. What are the effects on the persons against whom the prejudice is directed, as well as on the persons who have the prejudice? How can we develop unity through diversity?

THE AMERICAN FAMILY

By EDUARD C. LINDEMAN

THE United States is not to be spared from participation in the tragedy of our era. And psychologically the American people are not prepared for the events through which they must live. The plain truth to be faced is that we are in the midst of a world-wide revolution, the outcome of which will set the pattern of life for a long time to come. Being part of this revolution, we can be saved only by positive action; and we can go into effective action only if we know in which direction we wish to move.

A popular Chinese maxim says: *Only those who hate war can win this war.* If the war is won by those who glorify war and the use of force, democracy and human freedom will disappear. A war economy is coming now; we cannot prevent that, but we can, by foresight, prevent the war economy from destroying the fundamental values of our democracy.

It is the family which will feel the consequences of a war economy very quickly. Already millions of young men are living in army barracks; young and older men have moved away from home to work in war industries; families tend to move about at an accelerated rate—all of this contributes to an increase in family instability. And the economic dislocations of war show themselves first in family life, in the price of food, for example. Under the conditions of war, economy commodities are bound to become scarcer; and when commodities become scarce, prices go up, and families suffer.

With inflation comes a growth in suspicion. The consumers, *i.e.*, the family, distrust retailers, retailers distrust wholesalers, wholesalers distrust manufacturers, and if the inflation goes far enough, everybody will distrust the government. Of course our personal frictions will seem to be absorbed by the larger external conflict; but this does not *resolve* these personal conflicts. We are still paying a heavy price for the mass unadjustments which followed in the trail of World War I.

Aware of these disturbances to family life, we must begin now to lay our plans for a good life in the future. It will be too late if we wait until the war is over. If this revolutionary movement has any rational meaning it is that those nations now defending themselves against aggressors have two main objectives: first, to remove the threat of aggression and found a world on law, order, freedom and human dignity; and secondly, to fulfill the promises of what a democratic culture should be.

The democracies are fighting for their right to existence, but they are also fighting to make that existence more stable, more humane, and more just. This program calls for an expansion of all our skills, but even more important, it demands an extension of our social feelings. We Americans, if our democratic presumptions are sincere, must agree that our democracy looks toward the time when our families will be sheltered in good and beautiful homes, when all members of the family group will be properly nourished, and when they will receive effective medical attention and an appropriate education. In short, the democratic ideal implies that we all want everybody to enjoy a good life. A good life begins in families; otherwise, it is unattainable.

YOUTH ATTITUDES AND FAMILY MORALE

By MRS. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

ALL young people have different attitudes—the attitudes of youth are as varied as the young people themselves. When we discuss youth attitudes and morale many of us forget about the great influence of older people, that almost all of youth's attitudes stem from attitudes of older people and not always from parents—sometimes from their

teachers, sometimes from older friends of the family. Not many of their attitudes seem to stem from their own contemporaries.

In spite of the enormous diversity in the attitudes of youth, the one common prevalent attitude is the desire *to do,* to stop talking and thinking about things and actually to do something. Most of the dissatisfaction in army camps, for example, came about because the young people could not quite see what they were supposed to be doing. This urge to do has been the basic psychology of all young people at all times.

We cannot get our youth to accept responsibility in our modern life unless they can see themselves doing the kind of a job which is constructive, something which goes on developing, and which shows a clear pathway to follow. Almost any group of young people will tell you that they want to help build a better world. They cannot chart that better world with any precision. But it is the phrase which expresses the real thing they are seeking.

I am not a bit afraid about the morale of our young people. I am much more worried that we older people won't keep up our morale so that we can really give the proper background for the growth of young people. Perhaps we are the ones who really bear the responsibility for teaching the things which will create a sense of responsibility in youth. We can't expect, of course, that youth will have gray hairs or will think constantly about the serious things in life. But I think we can open doors to youth which will create the morale we worry about, because they will gain an understanding of this whole flow of life which is going to change—change for us, change for the rest of the world—and which is going to mean that our young people, willy-nilly, must carry a great burden of responsibility. Therefore, we must give them the background of courage, intelligent leadership, and confidence that they can carry the responsibilities and have the morale for no matter what situations arise.

INTOLERANCE—ITS TOLL UPON THE INTOLERANT

By DAVID M. LEVY, M.D.

INTOLERANT people are people who hate. Their degree of intolerance is a measure of their hate. When a person is characteristically intolerant, he belongs to the group of the psychologically hostile. The most typical finding for this group is a stultification of the personality. There is a constriction of thought, feeling, and imagination. This applies equally well to the haters who have repressed their hate and to those who express it directly, in words or action.

The intellectual functions are narrowed because they are employed in building up accusations, in constantly proving the presence of the enemy, in interpreting his every aspect into further grounds for hostility, into a stubborn self-defense and justification. Feelings of human sympathy, kindliness, become warped. The receptive, creative functions in human relationships suffer. Suspicion replaces acceptance. The eye of hostility finally sees only danger and destruction.

These suspicions, attacking attitudes of active haters are associated with alertness and restlessness. The hostile eye must be forever watchful for the many dangers abroad. The phrase "consumed by hate" may be literally true. Psychiatrists are well aware that some individuals pay the price of their hate in physical distress and illness.

Of the dynamics of hate, most important is the anxiety that engenders it. Anxiety is the trouble-maker of the personality. Hostile acts or thoughts carry in their wake a fear of reprisals and a feeling of guilt. Later this amounts to a fear of punishment for the sin of hating. The hater, disturbed by his conscience, must furnish proof to himself that his hate is justified. It is along this line that the abnormality, the pathology of hate, is most clearly seen.

One way of justifying this hate lies in *magnification.* The hater builds up the evil aspects of the hated object. Starting with simple exaggeration, he may expand the process into fantastic proportions to justify his hate. A second method consists in finding proof of evil in every little detail, in misrepresenting every aspect of the hated object. Justification of hostile attitudes by exaggeration and distortion are common enough in everyday life. The difference between the hater and the normal person is originally one of degree.

A child who dislikes his teacher may, for example, exaggerate her foibles and misrepresent her actions. What was previously a smile is now seen as a snicker. Her praise of another is a sign of favoritism, and the marks she gives are proof of her unfairness. Among normal adults likewise there is a tendency to reduce the good and expand the bad aspects of the persons they hate.

For the real hater, however, this type of misinterpretation runs amok. The slightest remark, the most unrelated event, may be given the significance of a sinister plot. There is a long road between ordinary intolerance and the picture of Hitler-madness. Never-

theless, in any highly intolerant person you will see an unduly suspicious person.

The hater is motivated also by fears of retaliation. The justification of his hostility acts like a two-edged sword, for by magnifying the enemy he magnifies the power of retaliation. The more hateful the object, the more powerful and the more dangerous it becomes. The hater creates a Frankenstein monster and becomes enslaved by his own destructive impulses.

The release of primitive hostile impulses is so dangerous to human welfare that every measure is taken to tame the savage within us in early infancy. If we have done nothing more than to be petty, or nasty, or irritable, we feel bound of necessity to apologize, to make amends, to wipe out the bad behavior. When we make a definite attack with words or muscles, we feel a certain gratification in relieving our feelings, but then we feel the need to make amends all the more strongly.

This process of restoring, of making good, represents a definite reparative principle in human relationship. But somehow this principle does not operate with the real hater. His hostility is never spent. It is constantly seething.

Another process that follows the attack is referred to as "self-punishment." We see it in normal adult life chiefly in the form of self-admonition. Its abnormal side is seen in the form of severe and constant self-admonition, verbal abuse, and even suicide. It is significant that among the psychologically hostile suicidal trends are common.

Restoring, justifying, self-punishing are processes that are used not only as a means of gaining equilibrium for the individual, but represent also deterrents to the act of hating. By anticipation they help strengthen inhibitions to the act. One can see, therefore, how a preacher of hate, or how the inculcation of an ideology of hate, can break down normal psychological structures and produce a diseased personality. Because the justification for hatred is furnished in the ideology, self-appraisal is surrendered, and the need of making amends (the constructive phase of the process) is no longer felt. The brakes and barriers of hate are destroyed. Conscience no longer operates.

The disseminator of intolerance, operating on the fertile soil of the psychologically hostile, may initiate an epidemic of hate, as readily comprehensible as an epidemic of typhoid fever. The source of either epidemic, whether of typhoid or of hate, would be considered equally dangerous and criminal if public mental health were at all effective.

UNITY AND DIVERSITY

By EVERETT R. CLINCHY

THIS country is a family of national, racial, and religious groups. To read the list of the people who make up the United States is to state a problem. We are one-third of a million Indian; one-third of a million Oriental, Filipino, Mexican; sixty million Anglo-Saxon; ten million Irish; fifteen million Teutonic; nine million Slavic; five million Italian; four million Scandinavian; two million French; thirteen million Negro; one million Finn, Latvian, Greek.

In addition, our national structure is complicated by wide religious differences. We Americans are forty million Protestant, two million Anglican-Episcopal, twenty-two million Roman Catholic, one million Greek Catholic, four and a half million Jew, two-thirds of a million Mormon, one-half million Christian Scientist. And all these people are trying to live together.

Out of these many nationalities we are attempting to forge one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. Families and schools and churches have largely ignored the need for a special education to enable us to live in a country characterized by such cultural manyness. We have harbored such secret societies as the Know-Nothing Movement and the Ku Klux Klan. Parents and teachers of children have not solved the problem of intercultural relations because they have not definitely faced it. Prejudice, persecution, and hate-hysterias have been taboo subjects, especially in the schools. Many, even today, look at interculture education in the old-fashioned way that we used to look at sex education.

The nation's program of military defense includes detailed measures for sanitation and protection of the physical health, but the civilian population has not yet been taught to make their homes as immune to the infection of hate as they have learned to protect them against the infection of physical disease.

The existence of the religious and racial cultures of forty-six Old World nationalities in the United States offers an especially fertile field for the germs of totalitarian hate propaganda. For a hundred and fifty years we have sought in this country to adjust the relation to one another of the various national, racial, and religious groups of our citizenship and to forge national unity out of our cultural diversity. But we have not faced the problem realistically. Our attitude toward the various hate movements that have been a blot on

(*Continued on page 63*)

Children in a Threatened World

Chairman: Sidonie Matsner Gruenberg
Speakers: Martha M. Eliot, M.D., James Plant, M.D., Susan Isaacs *

The lessons we can learn from Europe must be supplemented by recognition of our peculiar problems. How can we help our children to some degree of security and adequacy and at the same time be realistic about the world they must live in?

CHILDREN'S MORALE

By SIDONIE MATSNER GRUENBERG

EVEN though children lack the experience and the maturity to understand what is going on beyond their immediate concerns, they are not immune to the war or to its demoralization. For they absorb the moods of their elders without being able to make sense out of the incomprehensible behavior of those around them. We want to spare the children the harrowing thoughts and anxieties which we feel. We sometimes assume that our choice lies between exposing children to all the horrors with the corresponding distress, or shielding them completely from all that goes on. But that is not our choice.

Children have a deep need for help in keeping their own balance and sanity in the atmosphere of emotional and spiritual conflicts. But the balance comes from the support which they feel behind them when confronted by staggering events or privations. The child's anxieties can best be met with the help of the adult's courage. If adults get into panic, the children will do no better. We can give our children security not by hiding them from life, but by helping them feel our support, our confidence, our faith in the endurance of what we cherish and strive for.

Children wisely resent being excluded from family troubles. An illustrative case is furnished by a twelve-year-old girl who had been sent away from home for two weeks in order completely to shield her from the knowledge of her grandmother's death and from the pain and sorrow attending the funeral. Aside from the question of what a child as old as this may be expected to face, and from the necessity of her having to meet this particular fact sooner or later, this girl was exposed to something more painful and disturbing than facing the reality of death. She felt herself being pushed away from matters that obviously concerned the rest of the family. Unless she was a complete moron, she must have sensed her parents' distress; she must have been disturbed by the secrecy, and her imagination was left free to invent endlessly fantastic explanations of the secret trouble. It must have depressed her self-esteem to be excluded from what was obviously of great importance to the family.

We have often discovered that children are more sensitive than we think, that they have been unexpectedly moved and disturbed by what we assumed to be beyond their notice. We have tried therefore to protect them—often thus excluding them.

The disposition to overprotect children is quite general. Parents worry over money, for example, but let children share only the feeling of worry without ever helping them get a clear idea of what is involved. Life is full of uncertainties; it involves the constant task of meeting the unexpected and making the most of it. That requires, however, a degree of confidence and courage and self-reliance which are possible only if the children feel that they are sharing in the normal hazards of daily living. We know that we do not help the kitten see the world earlier by forcing its eyes open in advance. On the other hand, we must know that we cannot prepare our children to see their world when they are old enough to deal with it, by forcing them to keep their eyes closed while they are growing up.

In every family the relations between father and mother must be compatible to some degree. For the sake of the children we maintain a surface appearance of calm while squirming internally. This restraint under irritations, the affected unconcern while being really worried by the bills that cannot be paid, can be justified as good form, or as necessary self-control, especially if at the same time we feel that we are protecting the children from disagreeable experiences. But we are hiding only the causes of our trouble; the strains and anxieties remain open. Accordingly the vague, nameless undercurrents of worried feeling often disturb children more than would an open and heated discussion, or a frank consideration of the family's economic problem. Protecting the children is necessary. But it is against children's fear and despondency and insecurity about their relation with others that they have to be mainly protected.

* *Paper from England read at this conference.*

WHAT WE CAN LEARN FROM ENGLAND

By MARTHA M. ELIOT, M.D.

The complete text of this report is presented on page 35.

EMOTIONAL STRAINS IN TIMES OF CRISIS

By JAMES PLANT, M.D.

IT IS in times of stress that we realistically assay our social relationships. In rather comfortable fashion we have gone along for a generation building a set of postulates which we are now to see put to a test. Each of us would like to know the answers to certain questions which challenge the very foundations of our work. I am certain that no one of us can answer them today. Perhaps they will be answered by these coming years.

1. The first question we address to ourselves. What have we learned about children that we can use in the present crisis? Unless I am very much mistaken it will be the children themselves who will tell us. In the past twenty years we have definitely achieved a better understanding of those who are really misfits in the complicated world in which we live, of those who deviate enough from the norm to make their adjustment difficult. But the question today is how ordinary, usual children will face the crisis.

Some clues we have. (a) From everything else that we know about people I think it highly probable that the children will pretty much copy the adults. The contagion of adult attitudes is extremely important. (b) The data from abroad seems to indicate that the problem of food and diet is of major importance. Prevention of "war weariness" seems to depend to a large extent upon adequate supplies of Vitamin B. (c) I suspect that the question of the number of children involved is of great importance. The individual shows a remarkable ability to adjust himself to those things which are being accepted by everyone else. (d) It is possible that these critical days will mean little to our children. They are a very immediate lot and show a surprising disregard of things that are out of sight.

2. The next question which raises its ugly head makes us wonder how much real progress we have made in these last forty years. We know perfectly well how deep run the emotions of man, how relatively recent and superficial is his intellectual equipment. Faced now with the licking flames of hatred, revenge, and intolerance—will we counsel our children in calm intellectuality to assay that which threatens them? Or will we fight fire with fire? In the heat of the present crisis are school and home to teach the child that we may possibly be wrong in what we stand for? There is a second answer that frankly recognizes the power and sweep of the emotional surges. This is that we whip up the loyalty and devotion of children to our cause, willy-nilly, right or wrong. The third possible answer is that we meet hate with hate, intolerance with intolerance. These are unpopular words, unacceptable to those of us who know the tragic aftermath of all this—the silly round of having to build life all over again from the ashes of fear and hatred. But we are talking about a *crisis*. Perhaps out of it all will come the realization in this country that the flame of loyalty must be kept burning always—that this is the only way to avoid having to turn periodically to the whip-lash of hatred.

3. The third question also challenges our faith in the theory which we have been developing. This has been the age of the individual. I do not need to recall the hundreds of times that you have heard about the cramping and thwarting effects of regimentation. And now as a crisis appears, what are we to do? Is all of this to be given up? Will the next few years perchance teach us that individualization is a sort of expensive luxury toward which man will strive but which must be forgotten in moments of present peril? Perhaps this highly individualized development is one that we can scarce now afford, one that must await a better stabilized world many generations ahead.

There is another possibility—that we have not given due weight to the values of regimentation. A long time ago it was very well said that one finds himself by losing himself. There is more than just the possibility that this is still true. Perhaps out of the present crisis will come a new recognition of the value of loyalties, of the strength and feeling of growth that comes to the individual as he identifies himself with something that is greater than he.

4. And these coming years will ask another question of you and me—perhaps it will be answered. All of us have more or less one common interest. We use various terms but in the main we are students of human relationships. Only within our own lifetime has there been a scientific approach to this problem. And how we have groped! How we have stressed our differences! Can we not find certain fundamen-

tals beneath these differences? I can only hope that the crisis will drive us to get at the more basic relationships and notions that run through, I am sure, all of our varied approaches.

5. Is there much of use in all of this that you and I have been doing? "Oh, yes," we say, but does the rest of the world say that? What bothers me is that you and I represent a set of interests that seem to us to be of the deepest social and individual significance—but that in times of crisis, when our work *ought* to be of the greatest importance, we receive the scantiest recognition. An harassed people turns where it feels that it can get help. Will it turn to us?

6. And there is one more question that this crisis brings. It is to me the most important. Do we know for what it is that we struggle? Probably since that dim first time when there were two people, there were two different assumptions as to the means of progress. One saw growth in opportunity, in one or another manipulation of the environment. The other saw growth in what occurs within the individual. Down through the ages this struggle has gone on—scarce a century of recorded history when the difference has not flared into bitter flame. I take it that democracy is that form of government which is an expression not only of respect for the individual—but of faith in the individual. Seen in this light the struggle to preserve democracy is not being fought only on the blood-stained fields of Europe. The struggle is yours and mine, in our neighborhood and in our homes.

CHILDREN OF GREAT BRITAIN IN WARTIME

By SUSAN ISAACS

THE great disruption of family life in Britain because of the enforced migration of large numbers of children to safe areas, has thrown family relationships into high relief. Psychologists and social workers have had the chance to observe on a large scale what the loss of family life means both to parents and to children.

By far the majority of the children sent away were billeted in private households. It is the conditions under which children succeeded or failed in adapting themselves to other people's homes which we have thus been able mainly to observe.

It is beyond question that life in a rural district or small town has brought greater health and pleasure to many children dispersed from the cities and industrial centers. Yet it is equally true that these benefits have been fully realized only when by accident or design the children have been happily placed and settled in their foster homes. For children, people are even more important than places. Those who are responsible for planning and supervising evacuation need, first, an appreciation of what it means to children generally to be suddenly uprooted under the threat of bombing and taken away from their parents to entirely new surroundings; secondly, an understanding of the particular needs of individual children in relation to available foster homes.

Evacuation means, first and foremost, parting from parents and family. Children miss their own fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, and home atmosphere, even when they are happily placed and otherwise contented. The fundamental relationships of life have suddenly been cut across—for an indefinite period and, moreover, under disturbing conditions. With some justification the child fears that his parents may be lost forever, that before he can see them again or return to his home all may have been ruined. This fear was acute in the minds of many children. It had a great deal to do with the difficulties (such as bed-wetting, defiance, and stealing) which some of them showed at first.

The child's home may be poor and mean, he may be ill-taught and ill-trained. Yet to him home is still home; it is still the focus and center of his life—and that has suddenly gone. This feeling is strong in all children, although some show it more plainly than others. The younger and the older children (under seven and over twelve) are more openly affected. Children in the middle years settle down most readily in their foster homes.

The loss of parents and home is, however, only one half of the child's problem. The other half is the need to accept and adapt to the new surroundings. Unfamiliar streets stir up in many children the fear of getting lost. Again, to wake up at night with every detail of the house strange to him is intimidating. Unknown people make new and unknown demands. It takes time to learn that they are friendly.

This is especially true for those children who have been placed with families of a markedly different social and economic status. Take, for example, the question of clothes. It may seem a desirable thing on grounds of bodily hygiene to change completely the clothing of a poor child from the slums and discard all his own poor outfit. But some children have been so depressed by the loss of the clothes which their mother has put upon them, and the criticism of their mother this implied, that the ultimate effect on

their general well-being was far from advantageous.

New ways of speech and new codes of manners present similar difficulties. The child has struggled to learn a particular set of manners, a particular way of speech, in order to please his mother and father, and if now he finds that his ways do not please his foster mother he cannot change himself all at once.

The parting from his parents and adapting to life in a new home, moreover, stirs up again in the child, no matter what his age, those intense conflicts of feeling which he passed through in his earliest days of childhood. Every young child has not only feelings of love and dependence toward his parents, but also impulses of greed, jealousy, and defiance. Hence he feels a secret guilt and dread of losing parental love as a result of his own "wickedness." Being sent away from his home as a result of the war often revives these early anxieties and seems to the child like a punishment for his own early angers and defiances.

It is for these reasons that billeting has proved most successful where, first, there has been comparatively little difference of mode of life and social standards; and, secondly, where the foster home and the child's own home were able to maintain a friendly and sympathetic relation. The regular visits of parents prove one help in this regard. Further support is given by the placing of brothers and sisters in the same foster home.

Evacuated children need, first, warmth of atmosphere, love and friendliness, no less than good food, shelter and clothing. They need a *home*. And, secondly, they need help in keeping alive the images of their own parents and loyalties to their own homes.

While the great majority of evacuated children were able to adapt with a reasonable measure of success to the new conditions of life, the strain proved too much for a certain number of the less stable. However, even the more disturbed children and those suffering from serious psychological trouble often adjusted successfully if their needs were understood and appropriate foster homes chosen. As time went on it became clear that trained and skilled social workers who could understand the psychological needs of individual children were indispensable to the smooth working of the whole scheme.

The experience of evacuation in Great Britain has brought out in high relief the depth and strength of family feeling in ordinary people, on the one hand; and, on the other, the urgent need for skilled understanding of the individual child and of the child's point of view in general, if great social experiments affecting the child are to be undertaken.

For everyone who *likes to tell, hear, or collect stories; for the principal or teacher in charge of school or classroom programs; for librarians, parents, and anyone who wishes to follow*

THE WAY OF THE STORYTELLER

By RUTH SAWYER

author of The Least One, The Long Christmas, *the Newbery Medal winner* Roller Skates, *and many others.*

The story of Ruth Sawyer's storytelling, not written as a manual or textbook, but out of the passion, wisdom, and experience of a storyteller who has spent a lifetime at it. Check-lists, bibliography, and "a technique to abolish technique," give factual pointers; eleven complete stories serve as examples; but mostly this is a book to give the reader a sense of the importance and the rich heritage of storytelling, the joy of enchanting an audience, the fascination of sensing the story that "belongs."

Set it beside Anne T. Eaton's Reading with Children *(now in its third large printing, $2.50) on that shelf of invaluable reference books that are also delights to the spirit. Send for your approval copy today. $2.50*

THE VIKING PRESS, 18 E. 48 St., New York

This Little Girl will capture your heart

Our Miss Boo

By MARGARET LEE RUNBECK

Miss Boo is a very real and very observing young lady (six) as thousands of parents who have read the stories of her that have appeared in *Good Housekeeping* and other magazines will testify. Now all of her adventures, her commentaries, her delightful questions and even more surprising answers (to herself and others) as they are caught and retold with keen perception, have been made into a book. Every parent of a young child will revel in it. Peggy Bacon's delightful decorations make the book a joy to look at as well as to read.

$2.00

At All Booksellers

D. APPLETON-CENTURY CO.

35 West 32nd Street, New York

Parents' Questions and Discussion*

Edited by the Staff of the Child Study Association of America

How can parents avoid frightening their children and yet get them to take the necessary precautions for safety in case of air raids? My children walk long distances to school every day and ought to know about signals and what to do. I am afraid that giving them information will only frighten them more.

It is not what or how much you tell your children that frightens them, but how you tell it. Let your manner be sensible and matter-of-fact. Of course you should give your children complete instructions, as these come from official sources. Then explain to them the reasons behind these instructions. Make what you have to say simple and brief. Don't go into a dozen or so remote possibilities. Don't repeat yourself, or beg your children to listen so as to be sure to understand what you are saying. They get you the first time. After you have told them, go about your business and let them go about theirs. Your composure and ability to attend to all the familiar routines will calm them more than any number of sermons on being calm. Fear in children comes not nearly so much from knowing the facts about possible dangers and how to meet them, as from a "hush hush" atmosphere, or from feeling that their own parents are jittery and that there is something that is being hidden from them.

How much can my four-year-old understand about the war? And how can I keep him from hearing all sorts of frightening things from his older brother and his older brother's friends and even from some grown-ups? Every once in a while when he sees me looking troubled he says, "Haven't they caught Hitler yet?"

It is true that little children cannot understand what the war is about. They have no clear idea whether the fighting is near or far away or what it is like or what it all means. They are likely to catch only a mood of terror. Therefore "business as usual" and all the reassuring details and pleasures of their own small lives are the best thing for them. Young children will be better off if they don't hear constant war-talk. But neither should we try to avoid the subject altogether. Perhaps you can put it up to your seven-year-old that he, and his friends too, have a real "war job" right now in seeing that the younger ones don't get scared. That will mean watching their step with radio and conversations and seeing that others do too.

Yet we cannot completely protect even the young child from knowing that there is a war and that there is danger. In addition to thoughtless and idle talk there are likely also to be grim realities, and every family must take precautions. We can't pretend the war isn't here, and we will have to meet our children's questions whenever they come and at whatever age. The attitude which seems to say "don't bother your little head about such things" always defeats its purpose. Not only does this attitude give the child a feeling that he is not being told about something threatening, which makes it twice as frightening, but it also cuts him off from the comfort of being in on the whole thing with his parents. Even a small child who is puzzled and anxious may get a great relief from occasional direct and open talk about the war.

My eleven-year-old son seems delighted at the war. His walls are full of maps; he gets the news eagerly. He and his friends talk constantly about going out and "blasting" Hitler. "Just my luck," he says, "to live where there's no fighting. Boy! Would I love to have an air-raid!" I find it hard to believe he is really so bloodthirsty. Is there anything I ought to do about it?

Remember that there is invariably a thrill at the thought of real danger. It would be less than human not to be excited and stimulated. In many children the love of adventure is very strong and quite natural and is not as "bloodthirsty" as it seems. The sight of the aggressive primitive male animal, when he happens to be our own son, is likely to shock his mother, though rarely his father. But your son is not abnormal, and the kinds of feeling he is expressing are for very many—both younger and older—certainly natural right now.

* These questions have been taken from a timely new pamphlet, "Children in Wartime," published by the Child Study Association. Please see inside front cover for description of this pamphlet.

What can we say to our children who cannot see the sense of going to school or college right now? Even the boys and girls of high school age are impatient about school and insist that they want to do something about the war.

Their feeling is natural. We all want to do something about it and wish we knew what. Yet very many of all ages can make their best contribution by going on with their regular work. Many young people should be encouraged to serve directly. Others of high school or even college age will, for the present at least, serve their country best by continuing and in some cases intensifying their school work. Parents and teachers can rightfully point out to them how great the need will be for a generation trained and equipped to make a good peace and to rebuild a shattered world. School people have already begun to see that their work cannot go on as if nothing unusual were happening. Studies of many kinds will have to be redirected so that school work will be more meaningful to youth in a world at war.

Yet we must expect these boys and girls to be restless and to demand some immediate part in the war effort. The best thought of our various youth organizations—Scouts, Y's, Boys' Clubs, Campfire Girls, etc.—should be given to finding ways of directing into useful community work the young people's energies and enthusiasms and capacity for high devotion. And parents and teachers should do their best to encourage the boys and girls to join in such projects.

For the young people in college—especially the boys of military age—the problem may be even more difficult. We can tell them how great will be the country's need for educated men in the days to come. But to many boys its present need for soldiers will seem more urgent. Combining study and military training in the R. O. T. C. will be a satisfactory compromise for many. To others immediate enlistment will seem the only course. Each must make his decision in accordance with his own conscience. For many the choice will be a difficult one. As parents we have not the right to interfere or to burden them further with doubts and reproaches. We have to recognize, too, that for many the opportunity to do war work is a welcome liberation from an otherwise meaningless or disagreeable program.

Until recent events forced us into a horrible dilemma, my husband and I believed and taught our children that hate and war were the most destructive forces on earth. We taught them also to respect and believe in the reasonableness of human beings of all races and nationalities. Now there is an orgy of hate let loose. I believe my older children can keep their balance, but I dread the effect on the little ones. Must even the babies hate?

A few days before war broke out one of our radio news analysts said something like this: "I am going to say what within a week may be treasonous. I am going to say that in spite of all that has happened, Japanese are still human beings—Germans are still human beings. If Americans forget this, even though they win the war, they are in danger of losing the peace."

These are wise words, too wise perhaps for children to understand. But if parents believe them they cannot help making their attitude count with their children, even while they whole-heartedly give their full support to this war. Of course there are countless decent Germans and decent Japanese, and even many millions more who are just helpless and bewildered. But if we have brought up our children to believe that *all* people can be counted on to be just and reasonable, we have certainly deceived them and need to revise our teaching. Even the youngest child can be told that there are certainly dangerous people in the world, and when these get to be heads of government, they kill and rob people to get what they want. If their own citizens don't stop them, the time comes when others must. That means war.

Perhaps this is too detached a view for people who have lost and suffered through the evil doings of others; it is only one possible attitude. Each of us will have to find where he stands. Meanwhile, perhaps, the best thing we can do is to help our children to be fair to others of enemy alien descent with whom they come in contact and who are certainly not responsible for this war. If they really love justice they will not tolerate ostracizing the classmate whose parents come from Germany, or ridiculing Japanese children in their community, or stealing fruit from the corner grocer whose name and accent are Italian. Feeling as we do, we must oppose these things even though in war they may be "natural." If we can keep a spirit of justice and kindness alive in this practical sense we probably need not fear permanent injury to our children's characters. If your children are emotionally sound, well-balanced personalities, all the wartime propaganda that they will run across in movies, radio, comics and elsewhere will probably leave them essentially unharmed.

Remember, too, that there is a real distinction between an unhealthy and destructive type of hatred and the righteous indignation that a normal person feels toward cruelty and injustice. There are some kinds of action that should not be tolerated and that we are glad to see our children hotly resent. It is well for them to hate the oppression of weaker nations by stronger ones, to hate the suppressors of freedom, to hate race and religious persecution. When they see in such persons as Hitler and Mussolini the very embodiment of cruelty, they can hardly help hating them too—for these are today the flesh and blood symbols of all that is detestable in men. There are some things worse than bloodshed. These are slavery and degradation. Let us not be afraid to say so.

Suggestions for Study: Family Morale in a World at War

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

I. The Home Front

Good homes are the first line of defense. Family morale is the basis of all morale. But in these critical days family well-being is threatened in many ways. It is encouraging, however, to discover how aware our government has been of the importance of family values. They have been carefully considered in administering the draft law, in planning for recreation in camps and industrial areas, in helping local communities to deal with the puzzling health and welfare problems created by the crisis. While the emergency intensifies the immediate problems of family life for many—it may bring some permanent gains in social awareness and social planning for family needs.

II. American Unity

Democracy implies the right to freedom and the good life *for all people*. But our democracy is far from perfect. If we are ready to fight to preserve it, we must be ready to develop and fulfill it more completely. Nor must we lose sight of our ideals in the course of defending them. Intolerance and suspicion thrive in war time. They are inimical to the democratic ideal. In this country—with its many diverse racial and religious groups—intolerance can all too easily destroy national unity. Epidemics of hate and intolerance are contagious. We must learn to immunize the nation against them. In this task the family can play an important rôle.

III. Children in a Threatened World

Children need help in keeping their balance in a threatened and threatening world. We can help them—not by hiding dangers and unpleasant realities—but by our own courage and confidence in facing whatever comes. The child's security is deeply bound up with the intimate give and take of family life. English experience in evacuating children has made this abundantly clear. English experience has shown, too, how important are trained workers and well-organized social services in meeting the intensified problems of child welfare in a national crisis. Inadequacies in our social machinery in times of peace become serious threats to national well-being in times of greater stress.

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

1. Mrs. B. is the mother of two young children. She does all her own work, except the laundry. She has been attending a child study group and finding it very helpful. Now she feels that she ought to be doing some kind of "war work." But there just doesn't seem to be time for anything more. What is the patriotic thing for her to do? Why do you think so?

2. There are several children of German and Italian parentage in the 5th Grade class of a city public school. Since the outbreak of the war they have been virtually ostracized by the other children. Is there anything for the teacher to do about it—with the children, with the parents? What stand should the parents of the "American" children take? How can the parents of the "enemy" children help them to face the situation?

3. Suppose you live in a suburban community which has volunteered to care for 100 children in case their evacuation from a nearby city should be necessary. If you were a member of the volunteer committee in charge, what suggestions would you make about foster home selection and supervision? What advice would be helpful to the foster mothers? What part of the task might be handled by volunteers? At what point would professionally trained workers be needed?

REFERENCE READING

Children in Wartime.....1942
by staff of the Child Study Association
Child Study Association, 221 West 57th Street

The Psychiatric Aspects of Civilian Morale As Related to Children
by Douglas A. Thom Mental Hygiene, October, 1941

Ideals for Today's Family.....Spring, 1941
Child Study Magazine—Vol. VIII, No. 3

Borrowed Children.....1940
by Mrs. St. Loe Strachey Commonwealth Fund

The Happy Family.....1938
by John Levy and Ruth Monroe Knopf

Who Are These Americans?.....1939
by Paul B. Sears Macmillan

Book Reviews

What Books for Children? By Josette Frank. Doubleday, Doran & Company, Inc., Revised, 1941. 462 pp. $2.50.

IN THIS revised and enlarged edition of "What Books for Children?" Miss Frank has made a brilliant contribution to our understanding of this perplexing problem. It is a practical and readable guide for parents and teachers. While the entire book is excellent, the two new chapters, "The Comics" and "Radio and Reading," are especially noteworthy and timely.

Miss Frank's discussion of the motivation of children's tastes in reading and radio is psychologically sound as well as clearly presented. She has traced children's preferences to their emotional origin and in so doing has performed a real service by dispelling the bogy of willful perversity. She has done an excellent job of reporting and analyzing her observations.

In reading Miss Frank's book one gets the vivid impression that she believes that children need the pleasure of adventure as well as education. "In selecting and guiding their reading we have hoped to impose culture from above. It is, perhaps, right and proper that we should do so. But as adults we have too often predicated our selections upon what we would like the children to like."

Perhaps too much emphasis has been placed upon the educational value as a criterion for everything that children read and hear. Children must be educated and we must guide them, but they are entitled to a certain amount of pleasure unadulterated by education as a primary goal. As Miss Frank states; "We will be most successful if we take our cues from their own obvious preferences of the moment. Not by belittling the comics hero but by accepting him as a starting point, we may build a basis of common sympathy to make our book suggestions both more acceptable and more effective. There need be no question of either-or the comics or good books; many children will be able and eager to read both."

Regarding radio she says, "The question whether radio is to be or not to be a part of our children's daily lives has been settled. . . . Parents are no longer called upon to approve of radio or otherwise. We are called upon rather to learn to use it as an instrument for pleasure or education, for the best interests of all the family, and to help our children make the most of what it offers and can offer for their entertainment and profit."

The other chapters in this book are equally excellent. The carefully annotated book lists, divided according to subject matter and interest levels for different age groups, are especially helpful. There is also a very useful evaluation of the various publishers and editors whose comic books bear a definite editorial policy.

Every parent and teacher would profit from reading this book.

S. HARCOURT PEPPARD, M.D.
Acting Director of Bureau of Child Guidance
New York City Board of Education

Personal Problems of Everyday Life: Practical Aspects of Mental Hygiene. By Lee E. Travis and Dorothy W. Baruch. D. Appleton Century, N. Y., 1941. 391 pp. $2.75.

It is safe to assume that people turn to books on mental hygiene because they are trying to understand themselves and to solve their own problems. They get little help if their reading remains a purely intellectual experience. Travis and Baruch are fully aware of the need to involve their readers more deeply. They are unusually successful in stimulating emotional participation: first, by setting off the process of self-exploration which is the basis of all psychotherapy, and second, by conveying that feeling of fundamental acceptance which alone makes this process tolerable.

In simple, non-technical language, and with a wealth of everyday illustration, they discuss the problems of ordinary people. Behavior is explained in terms of our fundamental needs and our complex attempts to satisfy them or to deny them. Our present attitudes and our typical ways of responding are traced to their roots in past experience. Healthy and unhealthy ways of meeting emotional problems are distinguished. The value of and the indication for professional help are stressed.

All this is applied to the needs of children, and there is a strong plea for methods of care and training which will encourage healthy emotional growth; the importance of security and warm response are emphasized; more gradual and kindlier social training is urged, and a more positive accepting attitude toward bodily gratification. Finally there is a strong plea for helping the child to accept and express his hostile and jealous feelings instead of forcing him to deny and repress them.

Most of this material is excellent. However, one questions the wisdom of counselling parents to go to the lengths suggested in tolerating hostile behavior from their children, even for curative purposes. The young child counts on his parents to control the impulses which he is unable to control himself. The parents' failure to impose limits is confusing and frightening. It is one thing to let the child know that his angry and jealous feelings are natural and accepted—quite another to allow free rein to the hostile behavior. Furthermore, there is a distinct limit to what even the most understanding parents can or should be expected to take from *their own* children. The impersonal detachment of the therapist is neither possible nor desirable toward one's own child. In treating special problems which demand the expression of repressed hostility, many therapists suggest that it is wiser to impose definite limits on the child's behavior *in the home* and to allow the full playing out of hostility only in the therapeutic set-up.

We agree thoroughly that children should be encouraged to express angry and jealous feelings and helped to feel that their parents understand and sympathize. But we wonder whether the authors have thought through completely the need for a definite distinction between the rôle of the parent and the rôle of the therapist. With this one possible qualification, the authors' discussion of childhood needs and problems is excellent. It makes a real contribution in its deep feeling for the child's emotional needs and its emphasis on the kind of guidance which encourages sound emotional development. The book should prove invaluable to parents as an aid to understanding their children and themselves.

HELEN G. STERNAU

Children's Books

YOUNG PEOPLE AS BOOK CRITICS

ABOUT ninety boys and girls, ranging from eight to fifteen years of age, came together at a Conference arranged by the Children's Book Committee of the Child Study Association on December 2nd. This meeting opened the Association's annual exhibit of children's books. The idea behind the meeting was an excellent one—to get the reaction of children to children's books. Though we adults say so easily "Young people will certainly like this story," or, "Boys will welcome this," the final test of a book is the reaction of the young reader. At this meeting the young readers were given an opportunity to say just what they thought of the books written for them, and it proved most enlightening to the parents, publishers, authors, teachers, and librarians who heard these children's book likes and dislikes frankly expressed.

The young people were most cooperative and definitely articulate. Since they were largely of junior high school age, it seemed wise to use, as a springboard for discussion, types of books written especially for that age—career books and stories, girls' stories, sport stories, science and handicraft. The children's reactions, briefly summarized, were about as follows:

Girls' stories are universal favorites, and all girls read them. However, they are quick to see that the success pattern is unreal and the heroines' lives often too easy. They like stories of their own time and situations similar to their own. Historical tales interest them but, as May Lamberton Becker has said, "Young people are fiercely contemporary"; after all, the best bridge between the simple children's book and the modern novel is the story of a girl like themselves who meets the simple problems with which they are familiar.

Since the girls' story merges with the career story, adults often wonder whether such a book should emphasize the plot and the character of the heroine or give a complete picture of the career. These young reviewers believed that the story is the main thing. Although one girl thought career books "help us decide about our lives," more agreed that the people should be alive, the situations real, and the solutions not too easy and too optimistic. They are acute enough to tire of the Cinderella motif, though they confessed to a liking for the "happy ending."

Boys, too, like their career stories with plot and adventure. As one of them remarked, "Commander Ellsberg does not set out in his books to tell you how to be a diver, but he knows the business so well that while you are enjoying the excitement of his experiences you learn much about the job."

Girls as well as boys read sport stories. They know when such books fail. "John Tunis' *The Kid from Tomkinsville,*" said one boy, "is fast-moving and has plenty of real baseball in it, and a lot about the

character of the 'Kid'; *World Series,* the sequel, is all baseball too, but it's slow and it hasn't so much character in it."

These young people need no sops. They can take more truth and realism in their reading fare than we give them. Far from sparing them worries and pessimism by giving them unrealistic tales of success, we merely make them more conscious of the gap between such stories and life around them. Not pretty stories, but honest stories of boys and girls who had troubles and overcame them through courage and persistence—that is what they ask for. We adults should be encouraged by the toughness of youth's mental fibre.

Books on science and handicraft called forth more discussion. Some young readers think handicraft books and books of scientific experiments are too complicated and too technical. They object to the use of difficult words; one boy claimed that often the authors assume the reader to know more about the subject then he actually does. Such books need more diagrams. "No book can take the place of personal help and advice from someone who knows," was another comment. However, the group agree that in lieu of such a person, a simple book would be next best. A minority opinion was that since science is difficult and technical, it might be better to grow up before tackling such matters, for example, as the law of relativity. These comments do indicate that authors are not entirely successful in their popularizing of science or in their handicraft and hobby books.

The matter of illustrations is important to young people. They do not like solid pages of text. Books with marginal drawings and sketches relieve the eyes and hold interest. "And can't the illustrations be near the text they illustrate? It's such a nuisance to have to look on page twenty-five for something referred to on page five." The girls want the illustrations of their heroines to be good, if they are included at all, but one critic said: "It is disappointing to see pictures after you have already decided for yourself what the characters look like."

Comics were touched upon at the end of the discussion. The consensus was that parents take comics much more seriously than their children do. Boys and girls are quite aware of the place of such reading—it "rests your eyes," gives you "relaxation" after hard studying, "wastes your time in trains where you can't read anything else anyway." And as one of them said, "Adults don't read serious books all the time." They quite agreed that the superhuman feats of some of the characters are silly but they like to read about them anyway. One boy asked: "Why call them 'comics' when they aren't really funny?" There was a determined minority who stated flatly that they never looked at the comics.

All in all, adults might gain from these opinions a realization that young people are more acute critics than we suspect. One reason for their reading mediocre books is the lack of better books on the subjects which interest them. Young people may be ready for adult books and adult points of view before we provide them. Generalizations are dangerous but I dare make this one without fear—nothing could be more helpful to adults and to young people than many such conferences at which the young people could express themselves freely. Boys and girls have valuable suggestions to make about their books. Let's listen to them.

MARGARET C. SCOGGIN
Librarian, Nathan Straus Branch
New York Public Library

In the Magazines

What Radio Fare for Our Children? By Sidonie Matsner Gruenberg. Progressive Education, December, 1941.

What are the effects of radio on the child's attitudes, values, purposes? It is the "Uncle" programs which are particularly harmful because they act as disciplinary go-between and weaken the parent-child relationship. The older children who listen in tend to become suspicious and cynical since the stuff is below their intellectual level. One of the great needs of the growing child is for a variety of vicarious experiences. Omitting the adventure, suspense or fantasy of the radio programs omits perfectly good values and leaves the program sterile. Could we not, however, substitute dramatic stories of personal and social problems of vital interest to every boy and girl, dramatic stories of domestic and international problems which would retain the excitement values the children adore and add the values which make for democratic living?

Intolerance by Any Other Name. By Dorothy W. Baruch. Progressive Education, November, 1941.

Sharing, cooperation, consideration are social forms we perhaps stress too much. Many of the pressures our civilization exerts on children entail frustration and deprivation, which in turn cause resentments

which bring piled-up hostilities—hatred, aggression, class prejudice—all forms of intolerance. We can help children understand that their hostility is natural; we can help them find outlets for it. But it is of greatest importance that we are not merely acceptant but affectionate as well, so that the child will always feel free to express his feelings to one he trusts. Giving children opportunities to reduce their hostilities will reduce the seeds of intolerance.

Is Badness Ever Good? By Anna W. M. Wolf. Parents' Magazine, January, 1942.

When parents can accept mischievousness, untidiness, rebellion, as signs of normal child reaction which need help and training and redirection rather than as badness which needs to be punished the child is more likely to learn normal self-control. On the other hand, parents must learn to know whether these reactions are normal or the beginnings of serious problems. If in doubt they should consult a child guidance specialist just as they would a physician for puzzling physical symptoms.

People in the Comics. By Josette Frank. Progressive Education, January, 1942.

This is a discussion of the possible effects of comics reading on children's attitudes and thinking. Children are known to identify with the heroes in their stories. It is doubtful, however, that reading about gangsters—especially unsuccessful ones—makes gangsters. We cannot choose the child's heroes for him, but left to himself he chooses those which best serve his needs. Because the comics reflect the contemporary scene their potentiality for propaganda is enormous; but they tend to follow public opinion, not to lead it. We can help children to discriminate among the comics in terms of reasonable good taste.

Adolescence—Its Stimulations and Patterns. By Peter Blos. Childhood Education, October, 1941.

Emotionally healthy development in the early years facilitates healthy adaptation in adolescence. The oversheltered child finds difficulty later in breaking away from his family; new experiences become terrifying to him. Meek compliance to gain approval may in adolescence mean avoiding all self-assertion in order to retain approval even though the resentments continue. Or unfair treatment and arbitrary punishment may develop anti-social behavior to an extent where no authority is acceptable.

Radio and Our Children

FOR a number of years children's radio programs have been a center of agitation and criticism from parents, teachers, and others interested in the well-being of children. Unfortunately, all this agitation has had the effect not of improving children's radio but of curtailing it. Commercial radio has found it safer and perhaps more profitable to withdraw juvenile programs altogether than to risk parental criticism and opposition. As a result we have today fewer bad programs—but we have also fewer children's programs of any kind, and little encouragement for experimentation in this important field.

In the hope of finding some more constructive approach to the whole problem, the Radio Committee of the Child Study Association held a conference at the Association's Headquarters on November 13. The purpose of this conference was not to criticize or protest against the present state of children's radio, but to attempt to explore its causes and to focus the many divergent points of view toward a common working basis and a common goal: securing better programs for children. Accordingly the committee brought together in a panel discussion representatives of the various interests concerned with radio for children, including the major broadcasting networks, advertising and producing agencies, parents' groups, writers and directors of children's programs, research workers, psychiatrists, psychologists, and educators. Each member of the panel was asked to state the problems which seemed most important to him, and the meeting was then thrown open to general discussion.

Representatives of the networks presented several basic problems which are their special concern. There is, first of all, the question of time, and this is tied up with the question, as yet unanswered, of the age range toward which it is profitable to address children's programs. Children seem to listen to many adult programs over a wide spread of hours, not necessarily limited to those late afternoon hours usually thought of as the children's listening time. Whether or not such listening is desirable for children must be a question for individual management by parents rather than the responsibility of radio. But there remains the question whether and to what extent radio has a special responsibility toward chil-

dren at certain hours. The question was raised, too, whether children listen to adult programs because they prefer them, or because there are not enough programs on a juvenile level for them to enjoy. The lack of programs for younger children has been an especially vulnerable point of criticism. But the networks are not convinced that this very young audience is sufficiently profitable to warrant special programs addressed to that age.

The networks pointed out, too, the need for criteria and standards, not in the abstract but arrived at through practical day-to-day decisions on the job, and under the peculiar time pressure that operates in radio. To be of value, such standards must be translated into terms of concrete program materials. There must be sincerity, too, in the interpretation of these policies. The question is not "What can we get away with?" but "What can we do to meet children's interests and liking for excitement, without exploiting them?"

Discussing the need for definite criteria one of the panel members submitted the following requirements for a good children's program: "Radio programs for children should be, first, entertaining; second, dramatic with reasonable suspense; third, of high artistic quality and integrity; fourth, expressed in correct English and diction; fifth, appealing to the child's sense of humor; sixth, within the scope of the child's imagination; seventh, stress human relations for cooperative living; eighth, express intercultural understanding and appreciation." Naturally, not all of these criteria could be applied to any one program. Several of them were challenged as inapplicable or difficult to interpret in actual practice.

"Correct English," for example, could not be demanded of a program which calls for language "in character." There is evidence, too, that children often enjoy hearing "rough language" used in this way and are not damaged by it. Again, who is to determine what lies "within the scope of the child's imagination"? What about the giants in our fairy tales? Or Paul Bunyon or Hercules? Would Jack and the Beanstalk have to be ruled off the air by that definition?

The question of what constitutes "reasonable suspense" raised much discussion and brought out many conflicting opinions. The writers of children's programs especially asked for a satisfactory definition of this term. The script writers' task is to write programs which will succeed in holding their young audience. They must therefore write with one eye on the popularity ratings. They have no wish to exploit their young listeners, but they must, on the other hand, satisfy them to the extent of making them want to listen again and again. When they look for some guidance on this matter of suspense or excitement, they find a wide diversity of opinion, even among experts, as to what is and what is not harmful to children. Criticism and station censorship have so far not been helpful to them, since they have been largely negative. They have been too ready to tear down but not to build up programs—to take out what seems objectionable without offering something better to replace it. The writers' plea is for constructive, positive, practical suggestions as to how they may make their programs both satisfying to children and acceptable to adults.

Advertising agencies and production agencies, too, asked for more specific guidance—for standards which would safeguard their programs from parents' criticisms and still keep these programs sufficiently attractive to the young listeners to make them profitable to their sponsors. Several producers of children's programs told of their efforts to make their programs acceptable to parents' groups and at the same time maintain or increase their audience rating. They know that to do the latter they must make use of the element of suspense; but they do not know how much suspense is permissible—how much is too much.

One source of difficulty is, perhaps, the fact that parents find it hard to accept their children's likes and dislikes for what they are. They would prefer to have their children listen to "nice," innocuous programs but the children obviously prefer otherwise. There must be ways of meeting the children's legitimate interests with programs that are not only exciting and interesting but also well written and well presented. But the question of what is "good taste" in children's programs will have to be considered in terms of children's taste, not parents'—and must take into account also a wide variety of interests in the young radio audience.

The importance of research in determining what children want and what they are actually getting from their radio programs was demonstrated by reports on children's listening. These showed that each child selects his programs to meet individual needs of his own—the need for identification, hero worship, release of aggressive feelings, participation in adult occupations, romance, fantasy, and so on. Good program-making will have to be directed toward meeting these needs. Studies show that excitement, blood and thunder, even murder may serve legitimate purposes in children's entertainment. If we take murders out

of literature or out of radio, the children will go to the newspapers to satisfy this interest. But exciting programs must also be sincere, resolving problems of realistic human relationships in a sound way. They must offer the child an opportunity to identify with the good and not with the evil characters in them.

While there is need for good educational programs, it was urged that this must not be interpreted to mean that in order to be "good" a program must be "educational." There is need also for programs of pure fun and entertainment without any educational pretentions whatever. Psychiatry points out that normal children must have outlets for their drives, for their spirit of adventure, for their aggression, opportunity vicariously to do a little murdering, as all normal children wish to do, and to be super-beings, as is absolutely essential for children. In our civilization, none of us is able constantly to accept the restrictions, the things we are not permitted to do, the things that threaten us. Children may find necessary escape in hero or fantasy programs. They found such stories long before there were radio programs—or they made up their own. Such radio programs are perhaps our modern expression of the old folklore and fairy tales that children from time immemorial have wanted and will continue to want.

Psychiatry finds, too, that while some programs do cause fear, it is important to distinguish fear from anxiety. Anxiety does not come from radio programs. If anxiety is already there, certain radio programs may be the trigger that sets off that anxiety. Radio programs do not cause neuroses.

There was a plea, too, that ways be found to include in children's radio fare—not instead of, but in addition to, escape programs—some content which would dramatically present the story of our country, built on the adventures of our pioneers and explorers, our nation's attempts to establish law and order, communications, and so on. These have so far been woefully lacking in our out-of-school programs for children. Could not such content be made as exciting and attractive as the escape type of program?

An analogy was drawn between radio programs and children's books. The fact that hundreds of children read good books with "approved" content seems to prove that they do have good taste when fine material is placed before them, that they don't necessarily *have* to have murders for their entertainment. The question raised, however, was whether the problems of selection really are analogous, since in the selection of books there is usually an intermediary—the parent or librarian does the purchasing or selecting—while on the radio the child makes his own selections. His choices in this realm are therefore significant, and should give us valuable data about what he considers "good." Such information might be a useful guide in the writing of children's books. This is not to say that because a program is popular with children it is necessarily a good program, but merely that its popularity has significance, and cannot be ignored.

Since broadcasting is a public service, the networks and stations have been particularly sensitive to public criticism. Because of this, they have even been deterred at times from going ahead with programs they believed to be good. It was suggested that they have, perhaps, been *too* ready to concede to every criticism or protest, that they have been too afraid of making mistakes. Some mistakes are inevitable in any creative process, and particularly in a new field and a new medium. Experimentation must not be stifled by fear.

From representatives of both the educational and the commercial interests came the suggestion that possibly some kind of instrument might be set up through which the knowledge and experience of experts in the various fields—technical and commercial, educational, psychological, and research—could be made readily available to writers and producers of children's programs. One proposal—that of a preaudition board which would listen to and approve projected programs—raised many questions: the danger that, though it was not intended as censorship, such a board would virtually operate as a censorship or even *pre*-censorship; the impossibility of having any one group represent the opinions of such a culturally and geographically diversified people as the vast radio audience; the prohibitive expense involved for commercial producers in recording programs which then may be arbitrarily rejected.

The meeting closed with a feeling that while no specific conclusions had been reached, nevertheless the participants had achieved a greater understanding of one another's problems and points of view and a firmer basis had been established for working together toward the future goal of good programs for children.

JOSETTE FRANK

HELP YOUR COUNTRY—
BUY
UNITED STATES DEFENSE BONDS

Annual Meeting of the Child Study Association

ON FRIDAY the 23rd of January, 1942, the annual meeting of the Child Study Association of America was held at its Headquarters. The president of the Association, Dr. W. Carson Ryan, presided over a brief business meeting, after which he introduced the two guest speakers of the evening: S. Harcourt Peppard, M.D., Acting Director of the Bureau of Child Guidance of the New York City Board of Education, who spoke on "The Mental Health of Children in War Time," and Mrs. Maria de Gonzales-Vera, Exchange Fellow under the Convention of Buenos Aires to Promote Inter-American Cultural Relations, who spoke on "Family Life in Chile."

The director of the Association, Mrs. Sidonie M. Gruenberg, introduced her annual report with the following remarks:

"Almost suddenly, the whole world has awakened to the central significance of the family in these days and to the importance of managing it more intelligently. The family has always been tacitly accepted as a fundamental factor in determining the character of a nation's public life; today it becomes a public concern. From the White House Conference on Children in a Democracy, held two years ago, we got the stimulating phrase, "The family is the threshold of democracy." In the shake-up which we have all experienced since then, we have been forced to recognize that the family is also the chief concern of democracy. Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill told everybody that it is the family, the home, which is a major stake in the war. Every attack on problems of public welfare comes back to the family and its way of life. Every attempt to advance the health and strength of our fighting forces comes back to the health of the family, its handling of its resources, its use of common knowledge and routine skills. The vital problem of morale turns out to be a question of the family and its workings.

"The family is always the cradle in which a civilization nurtures its own future. In a civilization that leans so much upon science, we feel that the family must receive the benefits of whatever science can offer, if it is not to deteriorate and eventually fail in its chief functions. In a civilization that aspires so much toward the democratic way, every family must have access to such special educational aids as have occupied our own efforts through the years. Now the value of the Association's services needs no further demonstration. But the need to strengthen and extend our services is greater than ever. Limited as our attempts in the Child Study Association have necessarily been, and troubled as we may have been by our limitations, we must take what comfort we can from the fact that our growth has been in the direction of our contemporary social development, and that our work has been acknowledged as of direct and important service.

"From various directions—the United States Children's Bureau, the Office of Civilian Defense, health workers, visiting nurses, nursery school organizations, educators, parent associations—the Child Study Association has been urged to continue its work. We have at present two major opportunities: to continue all work which according to outside judgment is essential for the general welfare in terms of our special and distinctive services; and secondly, to use our experience and skills as far as possible directly to further the national war effort. We shall, of course, continue to explore both of these opportunities with all our energy."

Mrs. Gruenberg then gave the following report:

ACTIVITIES OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR THE YEAR 1941

Cooperation in War Effort

This fall we were acutely aware of the necessity for gearing our work to possible emergency conditions. The reports from the war-time experience in England revealed an unexpected lack of trained persons to cope with family and childhood situations. Excellent as the medical, nutritional and public health services turned out to be, the greater need appears to have been workers trained to help with the adjustment of parents and children.

With this in mind we planned for early Fall a special lecture series on "Children's Needs in a National Emergency." Lectures in this series were given by Benjamin Spock, M.D., Charlotte Buehler, Caroline Zachry, Thomas Mackie, M.D., Judge Justine Wise Polier, Jule Eisenbud, M.D., and members of the staff.

This series was nearing completion in December when the emergency turned into war itself, and we immediately offered the services of the Association

for the training of volunteers under the Office of Civilian Defense, Manhattan Division. Under the title of "Children in Wartime" an intensive five-week course of lectures, discussions and field work to train volunteers to work with children and families, especially in groups, was begun on January 20. This course was so heavily over-registered (more than 100 were accepted), that a shorter auxiliary course for 65 was begun on February 2.

Besides the work at Headquarters, our staff also cooperated in organizing the course for Child Care Volunteers offered by the Advisory Committee on Schools for Young Children, and gave a series of lectures at the Emerson School as part of its first-aid course.

Other Lectures and Courses at Headquarters

Three lecture-discussion courses began in February, 1941:

- Growing Up in the World Today
- Family Relationships
- Family Issues and the National Emergency

Three lecture-discussion courses began in October, 1941:

- The Nursery Years
- The School Years
- Growing Up

Leadership Training course for 100 parents of the Queensboro Federation of Mothers Clubs. (This course now being given for the fifth year.)

Annual Children's Book Exhibit: Lectures by Margaret C. Scoggin, Harry Zarchy and Commander Edward Ellsberg.

A lecture on "The Influences of Emotions on Health," by Franz Alexander, M.D.

Courses of Lectures Under Outside Auspices

The services of the Staff are in ever-increasing demand in connection with the training of teachers, social workers and public health nurses who consider an understanding of family relationships as an integral part of their equipment.

For the lay public (3 to 10 lectures in each series):

West Point (a course for wives of officers)

Housing Projects:
- Red Hook
- Harlem River Houses

Settlements:
- Hartley House
- Union Settlement
- Sisterhood of Union Temple, Brooklyn
- Merrick, L. I., Parent-Teacher Assn. (2nd year)
- Psychology Chapter of Women's Club, E. Williston, L. I.

For teachers and other professional workers:

- Lower West Side Health Center
- Bushwick Health Center
- Both of these courses carried "Inservice Alertness Credit"

Single Lectures

In addition to the above courses, the members of the Speakers Bureau staff gave 52 single lectures under various auspices, such as churches, synagogues, women's clubs and parent-teacher associations.

Family Guidance and Consultation Service

One of the most distinctive features of the Child Study Association is its immediate and continuous contact with the sources of individual problems as they are brought to us through the Family Guidance and Consultation Service. The extension of this service to include more intensive guidance for children, begun last year, has been much appreciated by parents who use this service increasingly. Parents and children help us to test our own theories, enrich our understanding and give solid substance to what we undertake as teachers. Dealing with the everyday adjustment problems of normal children, and emphasizing preventive work rather than deeply rooted behavior problems—which are usually referred elsewhere—we make available to teachers, social workers, educators and others, valuable material regarding the causes, course and treatment of these problems. During the year 102 new cases were served, and about 30 children were seen for direct guidance.

During the last year Dr. Katherine Woodward, psychiatrist, has acted in an advisory capacity to the Consultation Service, attending regular consultation staff meetings. She has also been available in cases where a special psychiatric diagnosis seemed desirable and, in a few cases, for treatment as well. We feel that we cannot stress too greatly the value of the addition of a supervising psychiatrist to the staff, and also the importance of keeping the service alive during the war, since it has proved to be a vital addition to the welfare of families in these days of stress.

Cooperation with Other Organizations

One phase of the Association's work which has had a continuous development has been our systematic cooperation with a wide variety of organizations. Thus we participated in the planning and carrying out of programs related to children and the family of the following organizations, among others:

National Conference on Family Relationships
New York State Conference on Marriage and the Family
New Education Fellowship, International Conference at Ann Arbor
Iowa Institute on Child Development
National Social Hygiene Day—in Boston and New York
Maternity Center
Women's National Radio Committee
National Council on Radio for Children
University of Michigan—Parent Education Institute
Michigan Child Study Association Conference
National Camping Association
New England Health Institute
Progressive Education Association
American Eugenics Association
National Congress of Parents and Teachers
Community Church lecture series
Public Education Association
New York Kindergarten Association

Institute at Hotel Commodore

The Association's annual Institute which was held on November 14, 1941, was on the timely theme of "Family Morale in a World at War." Gauged by the box office register, the Institute was a tremendous and unexpected success. The largest rooms at the Hotel Commodore could not accommodate all who came—more than 800 attended the luncheon and about 1,000 the general sessions. The staff was particularly pleased by the gracious words of Dorothy Canfield Fisher, the guest of honor at the luncheon, who said: "I won't use superlatives because they are not polite and because they imply comparisons. So I will not say that this Association is the most intelligent group handling personal and family relations. I will just say that if there is a more intelligent group than the Child Study Association on the job, I have never heard of it."

A colorful exhibit representing the work of the Association and of a number of other agencies was arranged by Mrs. Franklin E. Parker, Chairman of Exhibits, and Mrs. Simon M. Goldsmith, Chairman of Arrangements. The material presented at this institute, with several additional chapters, has been brought up to date and rewritten since the war, and will be published by Harper & Bros. under the title "The Family in a World at War," early in the spring.

Library

In all of the activities of the Association, the Alice Morgenthau Ehrich Memorial Library plays an important part. Not only are the books drawn upon in large numbers by members and the groups meeting at Headquarters, but unit libraries of 15 to 20 volumes each have been furnished for several of the outside courses given by the Speakers Bureau. The library is called upon increasingly for information—frequently by the New York Public Library.

Publications

Our quarterly journal CHILD STUDY, and our pamphlets and books serve to spread the work of the Association to the larger public too far away to benefit by the services at Headquarters.

This year there have been several notable additions to our list of publications. Besides numerous magazine articles, our staff prepared a new and timely pamphlet on "Children in Wartime"—more than 14,000 copies of which have already been distributed. There were two new books by staff members this year. "The Parents' Manual," by Anna W. M. Wolf, was published by Simon and Schuster; and Doubleday, Doran have just issued a revised and enlarged edition of Josette Frank's "What Books for Children?"

Radio Talks

Probably the largest number of individuals reached by the Association is through radio broadcast. Last year there were 24 radio talks given by staff members.

Committee Activities

An important phase of the work of the Association is carried on by active working committees composed of both professional and non-professional members, with staff members on each committee.

Bibliography Committee—Mrs. Irma W. Hewlett, chairman. Reviewed about 200 books of interest to parents and teachers, making selections for the library, and prepared 1941 list for Parents' Book Shelf. Also furnished most of the book reviews for CHILD STUDY.

Children's Book Committee—Mrs. Hugh Grant Straus, chairman. Reviewed about 600 new books

for children; prepared annotated list of Books of the Year for Children, and also unique list of books interpreting our country to children called "The American Scene." Held annual exhibit of children's books and meeting at which children participated (reported in this issue).

Radio Committee—Mrs. Frank E. Karelsen, Jr., chairman. Reviewed children's radio programs and prepared annotated lists of programs and commentaries for CHILD STUDY. Held conference for constructively improving children's radio programs, at which were representatives of broadcasting companies, advertising and producing agencies, educational organizations, parent groups, writers and directors of children's programs, psychologists and psychiatrists. (Meeting reported in this issue.)

Pamphlet Committee—Mrs. George Van Trump Burgess, chairman. Latest publication is "Children in War Time." Pamphlet on the organization and leadership of parent groups is under way.

Publicity Committee—Mrs. Simon M. Goldsmith and Mrs. Murray Hearn, co-chairmen. More than 100 articles and interviews about the work of the Association have appeared in the press, including a 3-page spread in *Life* magazine.

Consultation Service Committee—Mrs. Richard S. Emmet and Mrs. Louis Surut, co-chairmen. Has helped to promote and enlarge the work of the Family Guidance and Consultation Service which has now added a psychiatrist to its staff as the new director.

Finances

The Association is supported through memberships, contributions, foundation grants, benefits, sales of literature, fees for courses and staff services. Last year grants were received from the William C. Whitney Fund, the Greater New York Fund, and the Alice Morgenthau Ehrich Memorial Fund. Among the fund-raising activities were the following: Theatre Benefit—Mrs. Lee S. Hartman, chairman; "Spring Extra," a metropolitan advertising project—Mrs. A. Lambert Cone, chairman; Westchester Raffle—Mrs. George Van Trump Burgess, chairman; Westchester Dinner Dance — Mrs. James Durgin, chairman. These helpful efforts on the part of the board members and contributors, and also the fact we are fortunate in having our small staff supplemented by highly trained persons working on a volunteer basis, has enabled the Association to carry on its wide activities on a scale not otherwise possible.

News and Notes

New Director For Consultation Service

At a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Child Study Association of America, Dr. Bernard Glueck was appointed Director of the Family Guidance and Consultation Service, conducted by the Association. Dr. Glueck was the Director of the first Bureau of Child Guidance of New York City in 1921, organized under the Commonwealth Fund, and has been continuously active in the field of psychiatry. The Service will be reorganized under his direction, retaining its present staff and extending its functions.

The Family Guidance and Consultation Service was inaugurated by the Child Study Association of America fifteen years ago to meet the growing need on the part of parents to get expert counsel on the many problems, large and small, that are inherent in family life in our complex society. The Service now includes direct work with children, as well as with parents.

Volunteer Land Corps

The Volunteer Land Corps, of which Dorothy Thompson is chairman, offers an opportunity for young people to be of use in work the country vitally needs because the farmers of America are suffering from an acute labor shortage. Although the shortage is severe in many sections of the country, The Volunteer Land Corps proposes, for practical reasons, to concentrate its first summer activities in the state of Vermont.

Volunteers will live and work on individual farms, and will receive the same wages as private soldiers, $21 a month plus board and lodging. Young men and women over 16, in good health and capable of performing strenuous work, are eligible. Service in the Volunteer Land Corps is not of course a substitution for military service. Through the actual experience of work on the land, it is hoped that the volunteers will acquire perspective and understanding of the relationship between city and country and a sense of responsibility for the care, conservation, and productivity of our natural resources. Some recruits will be needed to begin work on May 15, 1942, and others will start about June 1st and June 15th. Each volunteer must agree to stay until mid-September.

For information and applications write to Volunteer Land Corps, 51 East 42d St., New York, N. Y.

WE CAN LEARN FROM ENGLAND

(*Continued from page 37*)

of volunteers. Even later, after a few trained social workers were assigned to the reception areas to be responsible for community organization and to develop social-service work, volunteers continued to carry the responsibility for most of the routine child-welfare program.

About sixteen months before the outbreak of war, at the request of the Government, one over-all organization of women volunteers—the Women's Voluntary Services for Civil Defense—was formed to coordinate all of this volunteer war work and direct it into channels that would most effectively aid the Government and all of its branches. The usual work of the many pre-existing women's organizations has gone forward as far as possible under war conditions to supplement in a great variety of ways the work of the W.V.S.

It was to the Women's Voluntary Services that the Government turned to provide the welfare services for evacuated children and mothers and to organize community activities in the reception areas. The day-by-day work of preparing for the reception of children, making surveys of local accommodations, keeping records, assigning children to private households and supervising their care, setting up hostels for temporary or permanent care of children, arranging for care of difficult children, finding and arranging with the health authorities for maternity homes and residential nurseries for young children, arranging with education authorities for setting up communal feeding centers and with other local authorities for community social centers, nursery centers, communal laundries and sewing rooms—all these and many other duties were made the responsibility of volunteers under the direction of the local authorities. On December 31, 1940, more than one hundred thousand women volunteers were assisting in the evacuation program. In February 1941, there were said to be between a million and a million and a half evacuated children and mothers under the Government scheme. There was, therefore, for every ten to fifteen children on the average of one volunteer worker to carry out the work for the local officials and to assist the professional health workers. Without this army of volunteers the evacuation program could never have been carried out as successfully as it has been.

The prewar lack of an adequate number of social workers trained in special service to children or in child-guidance work is now recognized by the Ministry of Health to have been a real handicap in the development of welfare services for evacuated children. It was not until after the great trek back to London had begun, however, that it became clear that specific steps would be necessary to prepare the reception areas to absorb the evacuees into the life of the communities in a way which would keep them from returning to the cities. The assignment of one of the child-care organizers from London to a county health department in a reception area soon proved how valuable such a worker could be to the whole community-organization plan, to mothers with individual social problems, and to the volunteers who were supervising the children. The number of child-care organizers who could be released from the London schools, however, was relatively small and could not meet the demand. The need for an enlarged training program was urgent.

The tendency for mothers to return to their husbands and families in the cities and the apparent need for more adequate welfare service in the reception areas resulted, in November 1940, in the appointment by the Minister of Health, Mr. Malcolm MacDonald, of a special committee to make an inquiry into the welfare of evacuated and homeless persons. The recommendations of this committee included among many other things the establishment of clubs and social centers for mothers, of nursery centers for young children, recreation centers for older children, communal bath houses and laundries, and week-end hostels for fathers and mothers. The appointment of more social workers (known as "welfare officers") was urged in order to coordinate and stimulate all welfare activities.

A similar need for expansion of the child guidance clinics became apparent early in the war. Both in the cities under bombing and in the reception areas, demands for the advice and assistance of psychiatric social workers, psychologists, and psychiatrists increased rapidly. There was, however, insufficient personnel to meet the increased need. Psychiatrists in many cases had been taken into the army, leaving the other workers to handle the clinics by themselves. In a number of cases the demand for even a single worker was so great that either a psychiatric social worker or an educational psychologist was assigned alone to an area. The assistance given by these workers to teachers, volunteers, and health workers alike in the handling of "difficult children" in the reception areas was incalculable. But there were and still are far too few of them to meet the needs. Since

many of the children's difficulties were of a relatively minor nature, arising in many cases from the feeling of insecurity accompanying the separation from home, the advice given to the foster mother or teacher by a child-guidance worker often made an immediate adjustment possible. Through their help brothers and sisters were brought together, parents were advised about visiting, and many other situations were adjusted so that the child or mother and child could remain in the country. When more serious psychotic conditions were found, the children were referred to the regular child-guidance clinics or for special interviews with psychiatrists. As in the case of child-care workers, the need for increased opportunities for training child-guidance workers is very clear.

I have dwelt so far on some of the measures that have been undertaken by the British authorities for care and protection of children in wartime, and have attempted to give you an idea of how important in the wartime program have been the pre-existing health services, the nursery education program, and the welfare work of the volunteers. Though I have chosen to emphasize these particular phases of the work for children in Great Britain, there are many others that I might well have selected, for therein lie experiences which are of value to us. There are, for instance, the vexing problems of shelter life so unfortunate for children, the increase in delinquency and its causes, the development of recreation activities for older children and youth, the medical attention for children about to be evacuated, the rehabilitation of the bombed-out and homeless families, the plan of education for evacuated children. It is not possible even to touch on all these.

I want, however, to remind you of the long process of planning and continuous readjustment that has been necessary to make the program work. It was in May 1938 that the first evacuation plan was drafted by a Parliamentary Committee. A test evacuation at the time of the Munich crisis showed up its many weaknesses and resulted in the transfer of responsibility from the Home Office to the Ministry of Health which is now in charge of most of the Government grants to local authorities. During the winter of 1938-39 careful plans were laid by the London authorities and by the Ministry of Health, with the result that when in September 1939 the first evacuation from London was ordered it went off like clockwork. Approximately 1,200,000 children and mothers were moved to the country, and not one child was lost.

In the beginning, however, the government had not realized how much more difficult was the job of the authorities in the reception areas, or how very important it was to send children out from the cities clean and in as good physical condition as possible. I have already pointed out the essential importance of proper community organization in the reception areas. It bears repetition, because the British authorities have found this to be the heart of the success of the whole program. Without it the return of the mothers with young children to the cities is practically inevitable. Without it children are underfoot in the houses of their hosts or footloose in the community. Without it delinquency among the older boys and girls increases. Without it private householders who have had children under their care for months or, in some cases, even for years, can be given no respite or vacations. Without it difficult children cannot be given the help they need in order to take their place in the new environment. Without it existing health services could not have been strengthened to meet the increased burden of work that comes with evacuation.

From all of this there is much that can be learned for application right here in the United States. Much of the British experience in community organization in the areas receiving evacuated children could be applied to our boom towns and trailer camps. The need for child-health clinics, for maternity services, for hospital care, for social centers for the adults, community feeding places, community laundries and sewing rooms, more school facilities and recreation centers for school children, nursery centers for young children, is as great if not greater in the cities and towns and rural areas in this country where the population has doubled or trebled almost overnight than it was in England.

If we should be faced suddenly with more serious defense situations and forced to provide special protective services for children in cities or other areas of potential danger or to evacuate children and mothers from certain areas because of actual danger, we might be confronted with a task for which we are ill prepared. The deficiencies in child health and welfare services in the smaller towns and cities would suddenly become high-lighted, because these are the communities to which many children from the larger cities would be sent. There is every reason why we should put our child-health house in better order in all communities and have ready the blueprints of a plan for emergency action wherever it may be needed.

With this in mind a small interdepartmental committee on health and welfare aspects of civilian evac-

uation was recently appointed jointly by the Directors of the Office of Civilian Defense and the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services. This committee, representing the Bureau of Public Assistance of the Social Security Board, the Public Health Service, the Office of Education, and the Children's Bureau, has been instructed by the appointed officers to study the problem and report on suitable plans of procedure.

Experience with our current defense problems has made clear the health and welfare hazards to children that accompany the migrations of large numbers of people. These hazards would be far greater in the case of an evacuation of any considerable number of children and mothers resulting from military action unless careful plans had been made in advance and the supplemental facilities and services that would be essential to meet the needs of evacuated persons in reception areas had been provided.

The outstanding lesson to be learned from Great Britain is the need to plan ahead for the protection of children. It is one that is hard to learn. Experience in our defense areas today shows that we have not yet learned it. It is time that we really tackled the problem.

UNITY AND DIVERSITY

(*Continued from page 43*)

history has been pre-scientific. We have not applied to our everyday relations with groups of people the knowledge which biologists, psychologists, anthropologists, sociologists, and historians have accumulated. This lag between knowledge and practice is no longer excusable. Today science has established that hate is an abnormality and, when carried to extremes, a disease with destructive effects—mental, emotional, and physical—upon the person who harbors the hatred.

Like any infectious disease, it is disseminated by carriers. Hate orators, hate publishers, hate organizers are as serious a menace as typhoid carriers. They should be hospitalized. They need prophylactic treatment, both mental and physical. The time will come when boards of health will isolate for medical care the abnormal persons who spread the ills that impair the emotional, mental, and physical health of the public, just as we quarantine the victims of scarlet fever or smallpox.

The important job in educating the family for better human relations is at once an intellectual and emotional responsibility, to be geared with the schools and the churches. We think in terms of immunizing people against a disease, and that immunity would be secured by the process of teaching people the facts. That is psychiatrically sound. If we tell the youngsters the truth about the various peoples who make up this country of ours, and they know the facts, they will begin to deal more intelligently with people who vary from their own particular way of life.

Along with the factual, intellectual approach, we must not neglect emotional education. That means giving our youngsters the kind of experiences with people of other nationality backgrounds, racial strains, and religious persuasions which will give them warm, satisfying, friendly, and happy associations with people of a different group. As we make it possible for our schools and churches and our families to introduce the youngsters of one group to the youngsters of another group in a way that creates emotional satisfaction, then we will have done the second part of the morale job necessary for living in a country characterized by cultural diversity.

One thing more: We need to hold before our youth some great goal, and that goal is at hand. The goal is to make the American Way really work, to become missionary-minded in sharing the American Idea with the rest of the world. American youth can be very proud of the great experiment going on in America. What is this experiment? It is the adventure of sons and daughters of all of the Old World peoples living together on one continent to create one nation of many nationalities and racial strains and religious persuasions.

We have in this country a Declaration of Independence for everyone, and a Constitution with a Bill of Rights promising freedom of the human mind and freedom of the human soul, with freedom of worship. This is the central core of the American nation as the world today conceives it.

Europe, too, may become one nation of many nationalities with liberty and justice for all. There is coming, inescapably, an earthwide union of the people of the globe; economically, all of the nations are interdependent now. This war is simply a method of determining whether the earthwide political union is to be a free association of people or an enslaved unity of the world. God grant that it may be the free society of free people of all nationalities and all racial strains and all religious fellowships. It will be if the central idea of the American Dream prevails.

RECREATION IN DEFENSE

(*Continued from page 40*)

their neighborhood need help.

We see these problems and that it is clearly the responsibility of the Federal Security Agency to help in meeting the situation. Choosing five industrial centers with unusually difficult problems, we put them under the microscope to see how they could best be helped. These were Detroit, Michigan, Utica, New York, Hartford, Connecticut, Delaware County, Pennsylvania, and Wichita, Kansas. We held a conference to which we asked representatives of these communities to come prepared to put all the facts of their situation on the table, for careful examination by the whole group. As a result of this laboratory experiment, they found that by stretching their imagination—and their funds—they could find new ways of meeting their emergency problem. Of primary importance in achieving these results was the organization of an over-all local community committee or council through which every agency and individual who so wishes can find his place in the community program.

The wisdom distilled from this experience was made available to other communities. Although the problems in every given situation differ from every other, certain fundamentals of good community life emerge. We cannot expect men, and particularly women, to stay in towns where there isn't a "good life." We can't expect a good life in any town without adequate provision for people's spare time.

An entirely different situation exists in the outlying military and naval bases: Iceland, Newfoundland, Alaska, Bermuda, Puerto Rico, Panama, Hawaii, and many others. Wherever our men have gone, we have sent staff recreation men to survey the community conditions.

What many have not realized before is that all over America, communities are in various stages of poverty in regard to recreation. These towns are hungry for the kind of program the Federal Security Agency is trying to help them have. Out of this defense effort—this organizing for the service of others—will come good community organization and good community solidarity.

We have a big Army, big unions, big industry, big government, but the flesh and blood of democracy is how people participate in it. Not only in the big cities, but in every small town and hamlet, the people have to play a part and feel that they belong. That is the unity which comes from democracy.

DARIEN *Established 1927*
Darien, Conn.
Boys and Girls, 5-13
Camp Life with Home Comforts
Program based on progressive educational idea. Modern buildings, sleeping porches, woods, lake and salt water, beach bathing. Small group. Counsellors trained in child guidance.
40 miles from N. Y. C.
Herman P. Baumritter, 123 W. 93d St., N. Y. C., RIv. 9-1869

CAMP ARCADIA
Boys 6 to 17 **North Belgrade, Maine** **Established 1913**
Non-regimented. Program sensibly progressive. Emphasis on sailing, fishing, golf, riding, crafts, nature, canoe trips. Bungalows with toilets and electricity. "A" rating.
Benj. Baumritter, 123 W. 93d St., N. Y. C., Tel. RIv. 9-4179

CAMP HIAWATHA **KEZAR FALLS MAINE**
Established 1920. Limited to Seventy Girls. Every camp facility for all sports on land and water. Dramatics, dancing, music. Crafts Riding.
Lucile R. Ryttenberg • 260 West End Avenue, New York City

CAMP ECHO FOR GIRLS
A progressive camp in Burlingham, N. Y., with an outstanding choice, non-competitive program. Work projects. Every activity. Riding. Mature, responsible staff. Enrollment limited to 70. 100-acre estate; private lake; 2½ hours from N. Y. C. 19th year.
Separate campus for "Little Brothers Up to Ten"
S. Seidlin, 7 W. 96th Street, N. Y. C. ACademy 2-7060

A NEW KIND OF CHILD'S NURSE
Today's nurse is a far cry from the old-fashioned disciplinarian. She really likes playing with children and working for them. She understands child training and child development, and realizes the importance of guiding the child toward independence. Her manner is the simple, outgoing manner children like.
Good nurses are rare. Won't you let me help you find one?
GERTRUDE R. STEIN
Vocational Service Agency 64 W. 48 WI 7-4961

STUDIOS OF MUSIC EDUCATION
A comprehensive music school, self-sustaining, non-profit making, offering to students of all ages: a thorough foundation in musicianship, the relating of technical study to direct musical experience, and instruction under active, professional musicians, chosen for their ability to share musical enthusiasm and stimulate creative accomplishment. Including interesting activities for the pre-school age child.
9 West 82 Street SUsquehanna 7-4292

NURSERY TRAINING SCHOOL
OF BOSTON
Summer Session • June 22 to August 1
Practice work at Ruggles Street Nursery School
Abigail A. Eliot, Ed.D., Director
355 Marlborough Street, Boston
Regular session begins September 21

DR. ELSA BRUNOTTE
Speech Correction Specialist
Stuttering, Lisping, Speaking Voice Disorders. Special Attention to Birth Injury Cases. Resident or Visiting.
Hotel Lucerne, 201 W. 79th St., New York. ENdicott 2-7100
Winter Address—Russell Park, Fort Myers, Fla.